

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXVI.

FEBRUARY.

[Vol. VIII.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir relating to the Estate at Kirkstead, in Lincolnshire, lately recovered to the Dissenters.

SIR, *Lincoln, Jan. 1, 1813.*

A considerable interest having been excited, both in this and in other parts of the country, by a trial which came on at Lincoln, before Judge Grose, at the last summer assize, and that trial having been very falsely reported in some of the London papers, I am anxious that a true statement of it should be given to the public, through the medium of your pages:—and, in order to have the case perfectly understood, I shall beg to offer you a short history of Kirkstead.

The lordship of Kirkstead lies upon the river Witham, at nearly an equal distance from Lincoln and Boston. Here was built, in the year 1139, an abbey for Cistercian monks, the ruins of which are still to be seen. Adjoining the spot on which the ruins stand, but beyond the ditch which once surrounded them, with a small pasture field intervening, is a chapel, supposed to be one of the oldest buildings in Lincolnshire. Its windows lofty and narrow, and pointed upwards, in the form of a spear, indicate that it was built before

the general use of glass, that is, before the twelfth century; and the tradition respecting its antiquity, which is current in the neighbourhood, is, that it had an existence before the abbey.

The property of the Cistercian monks was held under great and peculiar advantages, having been exempted from all ecclesiastical and parish taxes; and, at the suppression, it was given away, with all its privileges. There are many of these estates in the neighbourhood of Lincoln: they are extra-parochial and extra-episcopal; of course, they have no parish church, they are allied to no parish, and pay no tithes nor church lays.

The lordship of Kirkstead was given, at the Conquest, by William, to one of his Norman generals, of the name of Eudo; and in the chapel is a stone figure, imbossed, still in good preservation, of a man in complete armour. This stood originally in an erect posture, against the wall, but was laid down, as a paving stone, with the image towards the earth, till it was discovered, upon the new paving of the chapel, by some one who had more veneration for the monuments of antiquity, and, under his direction, it was again placed

erect, against the wall, at the entrance, but, unfortunately, the head of the figure could not be found. — It is not improbable, therefore, that the chapel was built at that very early period, for the use of the general's family, and that his own bones were deposited within it.

At the suppression of the convents, the lordship fell into the hands of the family of the Earl of Lincoln, and was held by a descendant of that family, of the name of Fines, about the year 1680. About this time, the heiress of the family was married to Mr. Daniel Disney, a zealous nonconformist, who, becoming proprietor of the estate, removed, in 1685, and took possession of the manor-house. We learn that, shortly after this, dissenting worship was performed in the chapel, by a gentleman of the name of Reed, to whom the lord of the manor paid, at his own pleasure, an annual stipend. We have no means of ascertaining whether any Protestant minister officiated in the chapel before Mr. Reed, but it is probable there were ministers earlier. The pulpit is a venerable piece of antiquity, and bears its age, marked conspicuously at the back, 1620. But the oldest Bible belonging to the chapel, was given by Mr. Disney, the father of Daniel, in the year 1699; and one was also given by Mrs. Fines, in 1672. — It appears, therefore, that Protestant worship may have been first celebrated there under the auspices of Mr. Disney, a nonconformist, before whose time, we may venture to presume, there was no Bible in the chapel.

It is not a little extraordinary, that in the register book of the

marriages, baptisms and burials, not only Mr. Reed but his successors, and among them Andrew, afterwards Dr., Kippis, affixed to their names the title of curate. Mr. Taylor, who removed from thence to Norwich, well known as Dr. Taylor, the author of the Hebrew Concordance, succeeded Mr. Reed, as minister at Kirkstead; settled there in 1714, and left it in 1733; and, in this obscure corner, this silent retreat, he laboured hard at his stupendous work. About this time, in the year 1720, Mr. Daniel Disney, concerned to see that the people residing about his estate were excluded from the chance of religious instruction, unless he and his heirs should chuse to provide a minister for them; and, fearing to trust to the benevolence of his descendants, and even to his own stability, came to the pious determination of securing the advantages of religious instruction to the tenants of his lordship, by appointing a trust of five persons, in whom he would vest certain pieces of land, of the then value of 33l. per annum, for the permanent support of Presbyterian worship in that place, and at his death, he confirmed the grant by will, and also gave the chapel, for the use of the Dissenting ministers, who should be chosen according to the instructions of the deed of trust. A Mr. Harrison, who removed to Diss, in Norfolk, came to Kirkstead when Mr. Taylor quitted it, and was succeeded, in the year 1759, by Mr. Dunkley. This gentleman continued in the faithful discharge of his ministerial duties, as a light shining in a dark place, for five and thirty years, and was seized on Christmas day, 1793, with a fit,

which terminated in his death, in the yard of his chapel, and amongst the bones of his parishioners, whom he there had laid to rest.

A few years before the death of Mr. Dunkley, the estate was sold by Mr. Fytche Disney to Richard Ellison, Esq. member of Parliament for the city of Lincoln. This gentleman had not been long in possession when he assiduously courted the friendship of Mr. Dunkley, and in a manner of which it will best become us to be silent, prevailed on the old gentleman, to accept him, by a deed, previously got ready, as his tenant to all the pieces of land, which he held in capacity of minister. But if we cannot explain the process by which Mr. Dunkley was persuaded to lease out the land to Mr. Ellison, we can, from the testimony of many now living, state the effect that transaction produced on the health and spirits of Mr. D. He was scarcely ever seen to smile afterwards; he declared that he had done what he was ashamed of, and that he should never more have a happy hour: in short, he was ever after an unhappy man.

The trustees who were living at Mr. Dunkley's death, resided in distant counties, and did not, for some years afterwards, hear of that event, and, of course, took no steps to appoint a successor to him. Of this Mr. Ellison took the advantage, and, under the pretence that the inhabitants of Kirkstead preferred a clergyman of the Church of England, made an agreement with a gentleman of that description, who lived a few miles off, to do duty to them once on the Sunday, for which he should receive from him 30*l.* per annum, the sum left by Mr. Dis-

ney, in the year 1720, while he held the land himself, having parcelled it out in the most convenient form for the benefit of himself and his tenants. At this period, which was seventy years after the original grant, our readers will know that the chapel lands must have been of more than double the value of 1720. Thus it happened that Mr. Ellison was suffered to appoint a clergyman of the Church of England to do duty in a place of worship, which had been expressly given, out of a gentleman's private estate, to the Presbyterians; and while he paid that gentleman 30*l.* a year for his duty, to put more than as much into his own pocket, from the proceeds of an estate, definitely given to Dissenting trustees, for the purpose of supporting Dissenting worship.

It happened that a gentleman was appointed in the year 1806, to an official post in Lincoln, and one of the first acts he was called to was, to recover from this identical estate of Kirkstead, a legacy of 6*l.* a year, which had been left by Mr. Disney, but kept back for fifteen years by the then holder of the estate. This circumstance naturally led to an enquiry about the Kirkstead living; and although scarcely a ray of light could at first be found, to guide to an investigation, with the concurrence of the Dissenting Committee*, in London, the indefatigable exertions of their very able solicitor, and the friendly and anxious vigilance of a distinguished barrister and sergeant, ejectments were at length served, and the action was defended by Mr. Ellison, in July last at Lincoln. A great mass of evidence had been collected, which

* Of Deputies.—E.

not only went to prove the right vested in the trustees, but also to throw blame where blame has been most conspicuously due. But it was not thought necessary, by the counsel who were employed, to go into it. The legal title was proved from the original trust-deeds, the discovery of which, in a very unexpected manner, rendered the action perfectly safe; and it was the opinion of Mr. Justice Grose, that no doubt existed, as to its being in the trustees, and that, therefore, a verdict must be given for the plaintiffs. A legal objection, however arose, upon a point which is of peculiar interest to the trustees of Dissenting chapels, and, indeed, to all trustees of public charities. The original trustees had all died without having complied with the intention of the donor, that when two were dead, the other three should renew the trust; and the heir at law of the surviving trustee renewed it in the year 1761. A similar irregularity was also discovered, in the other renewals, in 1772, and 1793, when only two trustees survived. It was argued upon this, that the terms not having been complied with, the trust had been made void, and the property had reverted into the estate. The judge, however, was of opinion, that the legal estate was in the heir at law of the surviving trustee, who had a power to renew the trust; therefore that his renewal was valid; but allowed the defendant to make it a case for the judges, if, on more mature consideration, he should think it desirable to do so. The question respecting the estate being thus settled, the defendant's counsel next endeavoured to prove, that the chapel was a parish church,

and could not be given away by any individual, and put into the hands of the Dissenters. The proofs offered were, that there is a bell to call the people to worship, a very old font used for baptism, registers of marriages, births and deaths, church-wardens and overseers, a pulpit, older than the time in which Dissenters have been known, and the ministers have usually called themselves curates. —Had the counsel on the side of the plaintiffs thought it proper, they might easily have shewn, that these are no proofs of its being a parish church, and that, in point of fact, it has never been regarded in that light, but always as a Dissenting meeting, licensed according to law: but they thought it best to wave a reply, seeing that the feelings of the court were against them; and under their suggestions the plaintiffs thought it most prudent to take a verdict for the estate, and defer the question of their right to the chapel for another assize*.

Farther Particulars respecting the Family of the Disneys.

In the year 1692, a small book was published by Mr. Daniel Disney, with an introductory address to the reader, by the Rev. Samuel Slater. It was written by Mr. Gervase Disney, and dedicated “to his dear wife, honoured mo-

* Since the above was written, Mr. Reader moved the Court of King's Bench for a new trial, stating his grounds before Lord Ellenborough: I presume they were the illegality of the trusts, which had not been filled up agreeably to the instructions of the donor. But his lordship, without asking any explanation, or taking the opinion of Mr. Justice Grose, who sat by his side, gave for answer, that there was not sufficient reason for granting a new trial.

ther, brothers, sisters and near relations and friends." The title of it is "Some remarkable Passages in the Life of Mr. Gervase Disney"; it was collected from his Diary, and methodized by himself, with a view to publication.

It appears from this little book, that Gervase was the second son of Mr. John Disney, of Swinderby, in Lincolnshire; his father had several sons and daughters. He writes, "As to my brother Daniel, he married, pretty young, Katherine, one of the daughters of Henry Fines, of Kirkstead, Esq. a co-heir." In June 1685, he writes that "his brother Daniel had just come down to his house at Kirkstead."

There are in it many passages which prove that this family were zealous nonconformists.

Mr. Gervase Disney was born in 1641, and received his education under two nonconformist ministers. He was highly delighted, after he settled in London, with the services of Mr. Flavel, on whom he regularly attended, till this worthy divine was thrown into prison, where he died of the plague. He acknowledges and laments the wildness of his youthful career, although it appears from his own remarks, that he was guilty of indiscretions rather than of crimes. He observes, "While at Barkston, to which my father moved, for the sake of religious worship under Mr. Trott, I went sometimes to Grantham, to hear some nonconformist ministers, as there was opportunity of their preaching, which was but seldom. Much soul advantage I received then, through the Lord's blessing, upon Mr. Sharp's ministry, who was then a nonconformist of very great note.

After this, my father buying a house at Lincoln, we removed there, and attended the ministry of Mr. Abdy, who was pastor of the congregation when liberty was given by the king's proclamation." He afterwards removed to Nottingham, where Mr. Whitlock, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Barrett were the ministers.

P. 66,—“Several troubles I met with on account of my nonconformity:”—he lodged the ministers at his house, and had many fines to pay in consequence of it. He afterwards fell under the sentence of excommunication, and expected that a writ would be taken out to arrest him. He then removed to Ollercarr, and sat under the preaching of Mr. Coats. About this time, much trouble befel him, in consequence of a letter which his brother Daniel had written him in characters, which was stopped by the magistrates of Nottingham, and sent up to court. It was supposed to be the Duke of Monmouth's Declaration, who had just at that time landed in the west. He then absconded, running great risks of being arrested and imprisoned, under the charge of holding a correspondence with the Duke.

In Mr. Slater's Preface, he says of him, that he wrote characters so well as to take down the whole sermon, and read it, verbatim, to his family, in the evening.

The same zealous regard to nonconformity animated Mr. Daniel Disney, the donor of the estate in question; which evidently appears, not merely from the grant itself, but also, more strongly, in a paper written by his own hand, to be inclosed in and accompany, the trust deeds.

The property thus recovered, consists of a hundred and forty acres of land, with a farm and public house upon it. I. W.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

(Continued from p. 5.)

In the course of the summer of 1757, the Committee were busily employed in making arrangements for obtaining suitable accommodations for the several tutors, and a public hall, library and classrooms, with a view to the commencement of the first session, early in the autumn of the same year. Accordingly, a range of buildings, at the north-west end of the bridge, was engaged, to which was attached a considerable extent of garden-ground, and a handsome terrace-walk, on the banks of the Mersey; possessing, altogether, a respectable collegiate appearance. Here the Academy continued for several years.

In their endeavours to collect a library, in some degree correspondent to the extensive plan contemplated in the institution of the Academy, the Trustees were particularly favoured. Besides several private benefactions of considerable value, (particularly from Mr. James Percival, of Liverpool, afterwards of Warrington, and from Mr. Henry Kendall, of Ulverstone,) Mr. Richard Grosvenor, son of the venerable Dr. Benjamin Grosvenor, of London, made an offer, which was thankfully accepted, of the fine collection of his venerable father, on condition that they should be vested in the hands of trustees, in such a manner, that they might never become private property, but that, in all future time, if any unfavourable event

should attend this institution, they might be transferred to some other Dissenting academy; at the same time, allowing a liberty to dispose of duplicates, or of such books as were not immediately useful for the design, provided that the money arising from such sale, should be employed in the purchase of other books, which should also be esteemed a part of the Dr.'s library. But a still more important acquisition was made of the valuable library of the Rev. Samuel Stubbs*, which his brother, Mr. Stubbs of Longdon, near Litchfield, was pleased to signify his favourable inclination, to have employed for the use of the academy, on condition that, upon the failure of the institution, they should be returned to him, or otherwise disposed of as he should direct, for the promotion of literature among Protestant Dissenters. These two large collections have continued to form the basis of the library at Warrington, at Manchester, and now at York; in favour of which last institution the surviving representative of the Stubbs family, has lately, in the handsomest manner, relinquished all claim to, and control over, her uncle's books. Considerable additions have, from time to time, been made, as well out of the funds of the institution, as in the form of benefactions from various persons, (particularly from Samuel

* May it not be a worthy subject of the enquiries of your Birmingham correspondents, to endeavour to ascertain where this gentleman was educated, and where he was a minister? From the number and variety of valuable works which he had collected, and the important notes and references, interspersed in the margins of many of them, he was probably a man of considerable learning and curious research.

Shore, and the late Sydney Hollis Foy, Esqrs.; and, since its removal to York, from the venerable Theophilus Lindsey, and Marmaduke Constable, Esq.); so that it is now become a very extensive and valuable library: it is still, however, deficient in many important respects. It were to be wished that a correct catalogue of its contents were printed; and if the *desideranda*, in the several classes, were added in italics, it would serve as a guide, as well to the Committee of the institution in the application of their own funds, as to those who might be disposed to assist it by benefactions. Many persons would then find, on a comparison of such a catalogue with their own, that several books were wanting in it of which they had duplicates, or which they might not particularly value: executors also, or other representatives of deceased persons, might thus be furnished with an easy method of enriching this library, without any, or with the least possible loss to survivors.

On the 20th of October, 1757, the trustees held a general meeting, at which the two tutors already elected, produced their plan of tuition, and their regulations for the government of the academy: and on the 23d, it was opened, for the first month with three students only, who were afterwards increased to five, the whole number during the first year; the two tutors dividing between them, during this first session, the business intended for the third tutor, Dr. Taylor taking the classics and moral philosophy, and Mr. Holt, logic, metaphysics and history.

Perhaps the present may be as convenient a place as any for at-

tempting to state the manner in which Dr. Taylor executed the duties of his office as a tutor in divinity, as far as it can be ascertained at such a distance of time.

From the high character which he justly bore, as a consummate Hebrew scholar, it may be presumed that he would be very careful thoroughly to ground his pupils in the knowledge of this sacred tongue. This appears accordingly to have been the case: from the papers with which the present writer has been favoured by the Rev. Thomas Astley, of Chesterfield, his only surviving pupil in these branches of learning, it is evident that, in addition to the ordinary modes of grammatical instruction, he drew out for them, and caused them to copy and get by heart, a sort of sacred vocabulary, containing copious and elaborate lists of the various Hebrew denominations of persons, things, relations, qualities, &c. distinguishing the various synonyms, with their different shades of meaning, and often supplying the correspondent Greek terms in the Septuagint and New Testament. He afterwards gave them a course of lectures, on the idiomatic phraseology of the Hebrew Scriptures; at the same time pointing out the influence which these idioms frequently have upon the Greek of the New Testament, and the necessity of being acquainted with, and constantly attending to, them, in order to obtain a just idea of the exact sense of many passages in the New Testament writers. The rules and observations contained in these lectures, were illustrated by a vast number of quotations from both parts of the sacred volume, as well as by many from the

Greek and Latin classics. They professed to be chiefly an abridgment, or rather a reduction to order of the substance of Glassius's *Philologia Sacra*; but were enriched with many additions from other sources, as well as from the Dr.'s own stores. They were afterwards enlarged by Dr. Aikin, particularly by copious references to Lowth's *Prælections on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*; and were occasionally repeated, (generally once, at least, in the course of each divinity-student's term of residence,) during the period in which he filled the theological chair; on which occasions they were perpetually enlivened by various incidental illustrations, which his extensive acquaintance with the poetry of all nations, enabled him to give, in the happy extemporaneous manner in which he certainly excelled all other lecturers. An imperfect copy of these lectures is in the hands of the present writer. If a perfect copy could be made out, their publication might even yet be an acceptable present to the Biblical student; although their necessity is in a good degree superseded by such works as Gerard's *Institutes of Biblical Criticism*, and the works there referred to.

Besides these lectures in regular course, Dr. Taylor appears to have been in the habit of occasionally delivering detached critical dissertations on a more enlarged plan; as, for instance, on the various scriptural senses of particular words, as of *רוח* in the Old Testament, compared with *Πνευμα* in the New; *Χαρις*, *Πας*, &c. Sketches of several of these dissertations appear among Mr. Astley's papers.

When he had thus thoroughly

grounded his pupils in the languages of both Testaments, and probably read with them a considerable portion of each, he led them through a regular course of theological lectures; for which purpose he drew up, as a textbook, his "*Scheme of Scripture Divinity*," which was printed for the use of the students, at the expence of the Trustees of the Academy; and, after his death, was published to the world at large, by his son, Mr. Richard Taylor, of Norwich. It has since been admitted by Bishop Watson, into his *Collection of Theological Tracts*; and it is certainly a very learned and valuable work, although by no means so perfect as its author, had he lived, would probably have made it. The general idea is certainly excellent, of studying the Divine dispensations historically. The introduction contains a series of observations, on the whole very judicious, on Christian theology, on the rules to be observed in interpreting the scriptures, and on the dispositions which it is necessary that the student should bring with him, to their successful investigation. Then follow some remarks on the Divine dispensations, in which among much good, there is, it must be confessed, some share of fancy, with regard to several particulars. The author then proceeds to a particular view of the creation; the institution of the Sabbath; the paradisiacal state of trial; the fall and its consequences (interweaving here his *Treatise on Original Sin*); the origin of sacrifices; the shechinah; the deluge; the dispersion from Babel; the patriarchal religion, exemplified in the Book of Job, its corruption; the call of Abraham, and

the covenant of grace with him (referring to his pamphlet so called); its commencement in the separation of the people of Israel, with the methods of the Divine wisdom in this important dispensation, (more fully enlarged on, in his *Key to the Apostolic Writings*); the civil government and ritual of the Hebrews, (Lowman referred to), its rational and spiritual meaning; the sacrificial part of it (more fully explained in his *Scripture Doctrine of Atonement*.)—He then gives a general review of the authors and what they teach, from the Exodus to the building of the temple: from thence to its destruction, by Nebuchadnezzar: the moral causes of the captivity, and the purposes answered by it: the authors in both these periods, particularly the prophets, chronologically arranged. Then, after a view of the state of the world at the coming of Jesus Christ, he refers to his treatise on the Lord's Supper, for his thoughts on the excellent character of Christ, and on the divine principles, doctrine and spirit of the gospel.

Thus far the work was printed by the Dr. himself, and employed by him as his text-book, in his lectures to the students. He always prefaced his lectures, we are informed by the editor of the enlarged posthumous edition, with the following solemn charge: "I do solemnly charge you, in the name of the God of Truth, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the way, the truth and the life, and before whose judgment-seat you must in no long time appear, 1st, that in all your studies and inquiries of a religious nature, present or future, you do constantly, carefully, impartially and conscientiously,

attend to evidence, as it lies in the holy scriptures, or in the nature of things, and the dictates of reason; cautiously guarding against the sallies of imagination, and the fallacy of ill-grounded conjecture.

2, That you admit, embrace, or assent to, no principle or sentiment, by me taught or advanced, but so far as it shall appear to you to be supported and justified by proper evidence from revelation, or the reason of things.

3, That if, at any time hereafter, any principle or sentiment by me taught or advanced, or by you admitted and embraced, shall, upon impartial and faithful examination, appear to you to be dubious or false, you either suspect or totally reject such principle or sentiment.

4, That you keep your mind always open to evidence; that you labour to banish from your breast all prejudice, prepossession, and party-zeal; that you study to live in peace and love with your fellow-Christians; and that you steadily assert for yourself, and freely allow to others, the unalienable rights of judgment and conscience."—It

seems impossible, as the editor justly observes, to adjust the terms between a tutor and his pupils more equitably. And yet it is understood to have been the general impression on the minds of those who attended his lectures that, notwithstanding his amiable dispositions and agreeable manners in the general intercourses of life, in his class-room his manner was somewhat dictatorial, and while he invited them to judge for themselves, he was not very patient of contradiction. This may, perhaps, be accounted for without much ground for censure, or for at all impeaching his sincerity as to the

principle of free inquiry which he charged his pupils to maintain. Having devoted his whole time, through the course of a large portion of his life, to an examination of the sacred scriptures, which his works will shew to have been patient, severe and unremitted, and which we may well presume to have been impartial, for its results were against both early prepossessions and present interest, he had been engaged, throughout the latter half of it, in publishing these results, in various elaborate publications. During this period, also, he was under the necessity of continuing his researches, and of further examining the ground of his former conclusions, by frequent calls to maintain that ground against numerous able opponents; he was also engaged in inculcating his principles from the pulpit, with great reputation and success: and he was now to engage, at the age of sixty-three, in the important office of training up young men for the Christian ministry, and in order to this, of leading them to a just and rational acquaintance with the principles of Christian doctrine, founded upon an enlarged and accurate knowledge of the scriptures. Impressed with the importance of this service, he drew up his Scheme of Scripture-Divinity, in which he appears to have had it in view, to collect into one treatise, the results of the inquiries of his whole life, interweaving, as he proceeded, his various detached pieces, so as to present before his pupils, the whole of his labours on the sacred volume, as it were at one view. To his own judgment, after the strictest revisal, the principles which he had adopted were perfectly just and entirely scriptural; and appearing to him as plain (as he sometimes told them,) "as that two and two made four," he could not always brook the (probably sometimes) flippant remarks of the young men, who themselves, perhaps, not always relishing the close confinement, which he required to his elaborate Hebrew criticisms, might occasionally, forget the deference which became them, to such superior age and learning. May it be permitted, without offence, to hazard a suspicion, that this might, not unnaturally, be the case with those, who removed, at an advanced period of their course, to Warrington, from Daventry; where, as Dr. Priestley informs us*, "they were indulged in the greatest freedoms," and where, having been accustomed to be referred, indiscriminately, to writers on all sides of every question† they were not content with being seldom referred to any but the Dr.'s own writings. His jealousy on this score might also be increased by a suspicion that such discontents were fomented by others, who he imagined, perhaps with little foundation, were taking pains to impress the minds of his pupils with different sentiments on theological and moral subjects. For it cannot be concealed, that considerable misunderstandings took place between Dr. Taylor and several persons, who had been actively engaged in establishing the

* *Memoirs*, p. 17, 20.

† Whether this plan of indiscriminate reference to writers on all the controversies of the day, is not, in Doddridge's Lectures, pushed to an extreme, and has not a natural tendency to generate a sceptical, or else a disputatious spirit, will perhaps admit of a doubt.

academy, and in promoting his health of Mrs. Taylor, had such removal from Norwich. After a careful perusal of a great variety of papers on both sides, the writer of these notes is of opinion, that there was much misapprehension and some blame on each side; but, as a complete knowledge of all the circumstances on either side cannot now be obtained, and, if it could, would be of little use, since the institution is dissolved, and the disputants have long since left the world, it seems desirable to suffer the whole to rest in oblivion. However this be, the uneasiness occasioned by these disputes, the change of scenes, of acquaintances, of business, perhaps of climate, and the extreme ill-

an effect upon a constitution naturally robust, that he died in the spring of 1761, near the close of the fourth session of the academy.

To the edition of the "Scripture Divinity," published after his death, were appended some excellent chapters, containing remarks on the expediency of revelation, replies to various objections against it, observations on the original and authority, the harmony and agreement, the internal worth and excellence of the scriptures, and the thankful esteem with which Christians ought to receive and practically improve them.

V. F.

[To be continued.]

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Richards's History of the Royal Touch.

[Continued from p. 11.]

Edward VI. Henry's amiable son and successor, is not known to have been at all an adept at this princely practice, or even to have been in the least partial to it. He probably thought so very lightly of it as entirely to omit and discard it, as he is also said to have done with respect to the consecration of *cramp rings*, by which his royal father so much distinguished himself. It is likely that Edward, young as he was, had imbibed some sectarian notions, which might unfit him for the performance of these sublime operations. Even the royal and episcopal work of *burning heretics*, so much approved of and delighted in by his predecessors, and afterwards by

his immediate successor, and so much called for and applauded by ecclesiastics, was to him an object of utter aversion; and if he once suffered it to be done, it was involuntary and against his own better judgment, through the importunate entreaties and urgent expostulations of his bishops, and particularly *Cranmer*, to whom therefore the guilt and infamy of the deed must properly or chiefly belong*. There is reason to be-

* So little did those reformers know of the *spirit* of Christianity: and yet they are still held up, by a numerous and powerful religious party among us, as patterns of orthodoxy and pure religion: as if those men who knew the least of the spirit of Christ, and the principles of common justice, were most likely to know most of the doctrines and precepts of the gospel, and be of all men the fittest to follow; or as if that religion should be the most orthodox, pure

lieve that no such doings would have sullied or disgraced his reign, had he been left to judge and act for himself. It is probable he was left so to judge and act with respect to the *royal touch*; so that we need not be surprised at his declining the practice.

From *Mary*, his bloody sister and successor, a different conduct might be expected: and her conduct certainly was, almost in every thing, very different from his. Superstitious as she was, and bigoted to the last degree, it is not to be supposed that she should shrink from the performance of any rite or ceremony, however absurd, that had been in request with her Popish predecessors, or devoutly practised by them. This of the *royal touch* could never escape her attention: nay, it is expressly said that the office was indeed fairly written out for her use; [that very office probably, which has been above inserted;] so that there can be no question of her touching for the evil, as devoutly and as successfully perhaps, as any of the rest*.

As to *Elizabeth*, heretic as she was, her legitimacy questioned, and her title litigated, she *touched*

and estimable, that shews the least of the spirit of the New Testament, and even allows of intolerance, persecution and murder.

* Her conduct, in torturing and burning those whom she deemed *heretics*, cannot well be thought more diabolical or execrable than that of her successors, *Elizabeth* and *James*, toward those whom they viewed in a similar light: the latter burnt them, as *Mary* did, and no less cruelly and unjustly; and the former imprisoned, tortured, hanged, embowelled and quartered them. This was the good queen *Bess*. Her whole bench of bishops, all of the right reformed and evangelical stamp, applauded her deeds.

for the evil, with a success acknowledged even by the Papists themselves, who are said to ascribe it to the *sign of the cross*.* A case is mentioned by *Carte*, of a Roman Catholic, who, being put into prison, perhaps for recusancy, and terribly afflicted with the evil, was, after he had been there a tedious time, at a vast expence of physicians, without the least relief, *touched* by this queen, and perfectly cured: which gave him occasion to say, he was now convinced, by undoubted experience, that the Pope's excommunication of her signified nothing, since she still continued blessed with so miraculous a quality.† —It was well for the poor fellow that he was not a *puritan*, or he might have gone long enough without his cure, as her majesty is known to have been inexorably pitiless and spiteful against that class of her subjects.

Of *James I.*, with his strong faith in ghosts and witches, and lofty notions of indefeasible right, royal prerogative and king-craft, it was not to be supposed that he, of all men, would think meanly or lightly of this royal and religious operation. It accordingly appears that he very readily and warmly engaged in it, and actually became a most dexterous and eminent practitioner, to the no small satisfaction and comfort, as we may suppose, of his liege subjects, as well as advancement of his own fame, or at least, the gratification of his vanity, of which it is well

* That part of the ceremony, however, appears to have been expunged in the next reign, and discontinued afterwards till that of *James II.* without any diminution of the effect. See *Occasional Thoughts*, as before, 62.

† *Carte*, i. 357.

known he possessed no common or scanty portion. Nothing could delight him more than the idea that he could work miracles: his courtiers called him *Solomon*; but that idea was calculated to make him think himself as still greater than even *Solomon*. We are not informed how many patients underwent or felt his royal touch; but there is every reason to suppose and believe that the number must have been very considerable.

His unfortunate son and successor, *Charles I.* was no less distinguished in this same way than his royal father had been. Great numbers are said to have been by him both touched and cured; of whom not a few were little children, which has been urged as a proof that it could not be ascribed to the effect or strength of imagination. *Carte* observes, that *Dr. Heylyn*, an eye-witness of such cures, says, "I have seen some children brought before the king, by the hanging sleeves, some hanging at their mothers' breasts, and others in the arms of their nurses, all cured without the help of a serviceable imagination."* Both *Heylyn* and *Carte* were full of faith in these miracles. If they were right, the decapitation of *Charles* must have been a great loss to the nation, and especially to those who were afflicted with the evil. For twelve years or more, after that event, not one of these miracles appears to have been wrought in this country.

As to *Oliver Cromwell*, it does not appear that he ever tried his hand at this wonder-working operation; conscious, it may be supposed, that it did not belong to his

province, or to the protectoral office and dignity, with which he was invested. What he would have done, had he accepted or assumed the regal title, cannot be said or known with absolute certainty: though the probability seems to bear against his even then becoming a practitioner, as it would hardly have met the approbation of his best friends, or accorded with the ideas of his most trusty and powerful coadjutors, or even with his own.

After a total cessation or suspension of this ancient princely practice, during the whole time of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, it revived again at the memorable *Restoration*; and *Charles II.* took it up vigorously and solemnly, and on a very extensive scale. The Register of the Royal Chapel is said to exhibit a list of 92,107 persons touched by him for the evil in a certain number of years,* not including, it seems, the whole of his reign; so that double that number, or more, for aught we know, may have passed under his hand during the whole course of his government. Yet we find he practised only at some particular seasons of the year; at least after the summer of 1662, when a royal proclamation was issued, to inform the public that such would be the case from thenceforth. His majesty had been then a practitioner full two years, during which time, there is reason to believe that he had touched some thousands. He began the work almost immediately after his restoration, so that it may be considered among the first acts of his reign. Of the state of the practice in his royal

* *Carte*, i. 358, note.

* *Athenæum*, No. 4.

hands, or under his wise management, a pretty accurate idea may be formed from the following extracts, out of some of the principal public papers of that era.

The following passage appeared in the weekly paper called *Mercurius Politicus*, of June 28, 1660:—"Saturday being appointed by his majesty to touch such as are troubled by the evil, a great number of poor afflicted creatures were met together, many brought in chairs and flasks; and being appointed by his majesty to repair to the Banqueting House, his majesty sat in a chair of state, and stroked all that were brought to him, and then put about each of their necks a white ribbon with an angel of gold on it. In this manner his majesty stroked above 600; and such was his princely patience and tenderness to the poor afflicted creatures, that though it took up a very long time, his majesty, never weary of well doing, was pleased to make enquiry, whether there were any more who had not been touched. After prayers were ended, the duke of Buckingham brought a towel, and the earl Pembroke a bason and ewer; who, after they had made obeysance to his majesty, kneeled down till his majesty had washed."—This was within a month after his majesty's arrival.

The next is from the *Parliamentary Journal*, of July 9, 1660; a fortnight after the other, and is thus curiously worded:—"The kingdom having for a long time been troubled with the evil, by reason of his majesty's absence, great numbers have flocked for cure. His sacred majesty, on Monday last, touched 250 in the Banqueting-House; among whom,

when his majesty was delivering the gold, one shuffled himself in, out of a hope of profit, which had not been stroked; but his majesty presently discovered him, saying, this man has not yet been touched. His majesty hath for the future appointed every Friday for the cure, at which time 200 and no more are to be presented to him, who are first to repair to *Mr. Knight*, the king's surgeon, living at the Cross-Guns, in Russell Street, Covent Garden, over against the Rose Tavern, for their tickets.—That none might lose their labour, he thought fit to make it known, that he will be at his house every Wednesday and Thursday, from two till six of the clock, to attend that service.—And if any *person of quality* shall send to him he will wait upon them at their lodgings, upon notice given to him."—In the same paper of July 30, and August 6, notice was given, that no more would be touched till about Michaelmas: and in the *Mercurius Politicus*, of February 28, 1661, it is said, that *many came twice or thrice, for the sake of the gold.*

Another weekly paper, called *Mercurius Publicus*, of February 21, 1661, had the following passage:—"We cannot but give notice, that certain persons (too many one would think) who, having the king's evil, and have been touched by his *sacred majesty*, have got the forehead to come twice or thrice, alleging they were never there before, till divers witnesses proved the contrary; which hath forced his *majesty* to give order that whosoever, hereafter, comes to be touched, shall first bring to his *majesty's* chirurgeons a certificate from the *minister* and church-

wardens, (where they live,) that they never were touched by his *majesty* before: the next healing will begin six weeks hence."

In the same paper of May 9, 1661, appeared the following notice or advertisement:—"Whitehall. We are commanded to give notice, that his *majesty* finds the season already so hot, that it will be neither safe nor fit to continue his healings such as have the king's evil; and therefore that his *majesty's* good subjects therein concerned, would at present forbear to come to court; Friday next (May 10,) and Wednesday (May 15,) being the last days that his *majesty* intends to heal, till the heat of the weather be allayed, and his *majesty's* further pleasure known, whereof his good subjects shall have timely notice."

The same paper of August 15, 1661, contained the passage following:—"We are commanded to give notice, that his *majesty* finds the season such, that it will neither be safe nor fit to continue his healing those that have the king's evil; and therefore that his *majesty's* good subjects therein concerned do forbear to come to court till All-saints day next, till which time his *majesty* doth not intend to heal."

In the very same paper, of July 17, 1662, appeared the following curious courtly advertisement:—"Hampton Court. His *majesty* lately set forth a *Proclamation for the better ordering of those who repair to the court for cure of the disease called the king's evil*, wherein his *majesty* being as ready and willing to relieve the necessities and diseases of his good subjects by his sacred touch, which shall come for cure, as any of his royal pre-

decessors, in which, by the grace and blessing of God, he hath in an extraordinary measure had good success, and yet, in his princely wisdom, foreseeing that fit times are necessary to be appointed for the performing of that great work of charity, doth declare his royal pleasure to be, that from henceforth the usual times for presenting such persons, shall be from the feast of *All-saints*, commonly called *Allhallowtide*, to a week before *Christmas*, and in the month before *Easter*, being more convenient for the temperature of the season, and in respect of any contagion that may happen in this near access to his *majesty's* sacred person. His *majesty* doth further command, that none presume to repair to court for cure of the said disease, but within the limits appointed, and that such persons who come for that purpose, bring certificates under the hands of the parson, vicar, or minister and church-wardens of the parishes where they dwell, testifying that they have not at any time before been touched by the king; further charging all justices of peace, constables, &c. that they suffer not any to pass but such as have such certificates, under pain of his *majesty's* displeasure. And that his *majesty's* subjects may have the better knowledge of it, his *majesty's* will is, that this proclamation be published and affixed in some open place in every market town of this realm."

To the above extracts, only one more shall be here added, from another public paper called *The Newes*, of May 18, 1664.—"His sacred *majesty* having declared it to be his royal will and purpose to continue the healing of his peo-

ple for the evil during the month of May, and then give over till Michaelmas next, I am commanded to give notice thereof, that the people may not come up to the town in the interim, and lose their labour."*

From these premises it plainly appears that the king really pretended to be endowed with the power or gift of working miracles, and of healing or curing one of the most obstinate and incurable diseases incident to the human frame, even by his *touch*. Most curious and ludicrous it surely must be, to see such a man as Charles making such a pretension, and affecting to be hand and glove with heaven; and no less so to see the whole nation, or at least the whole body of the church folks, or national religionists, (clergy and laity) which constituted the great bulk of the people, giving him full credit for every thing, and deeming the least doubt or hesitation about his miraculous claims as a sure indication of disloyalty, and scarcely short of high treason. Allowing or supposing his majesty to have really possessed this miraculous power, or supernatural healing gift, still it must appear rather a queer case that it should be affect-

ed by the *temperature of the seasons*, and actually controlled, overpowered and crippled, as it were, by the *hot weather*; and that the royal operator, in the meantime, in case he persisted in his benevolent practice, or labour of love, during the dog-days, and for sometime before and after, should be exposed to the imminent danger of some alarming *contagion*; at least, he and his courtiers seemed evidently to have had such apprehension. In all this, however, his loyal and admiring subjects could discover nothing, either marvellous or suspicious, or yet any way inconsistent. Their sovereign's miraculous claims found in them the most ready acquiescence. With some, indeed, especially among the poor persecuted nonconformists, the case was otherwise. They disbelieved those royal pretensions. But it only served to strengthen the public prejudice against them; being generally looked upon as an additional and sure proof of their disaffection, or their moral and political depravity.—So much for Charles's supernatural powers and miraculous deeds.

(To be concluded in our next.)

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to "Another Daventry Pupil." (p. 26.)

Essex House, February 1, 1813.

SIR,

When gentlemen, and especially those whom I have the pleasure to call my friends, think proper to honour my works with their

* See the *Athenaeum*, No. 4, p. 360.

animadversions, I feel myself reduced to an unpleasant dilemma. If I am silent, I am supposed to concede the justice of the charge, or to treat the writer with a contempt which I never mean to do, except where pretended criticism is evidently the coarse vehicle of unprovoked rancour and malignity. But if I reply, I constantly, and

unfortunately, however unintentionally, give offence. Little did I suspect that my late strictures upon the first letter of the "Old Daventry Pupil," would have proved so great an annoyance to the feelings of my worthy friend himself, or to those of his friend, the other Daventry Pupil, who has drawn his pen in his defence. I did not begin my letter with charging my old friend with the want either of Christian "candour and humility," or of common "good manners;" I introduced no sarcastic reflection, either upon his deviation from, or his adherence to, the principles of his education, nor upon his zeal for, or his indifference about, the promulgation of what he believes to be Christian truth. I brought no injurious and unproved charge of "gross reflection" upon the characters of eminently pious and useful men; nor did I, after having thus schooled my worthy friend, and after having exhibited a beautiful specimen of the spirit in which controversy ought to be conducted, conclude my epistle, with gravely lamenting the interruption given to "free, good-humoured correspondence," and with a threat, that if my worthy friend did not submit to discipline with more humility and a better temper, I should have a worse opinion, both of his principles and his party than I had before. All this, Sir, may be very proper in its place; very consistent with good humour, good manners, Christian candour, and Christian humility; and I have no doubt that gentlemen who write in this style are perfectly convinced of the meekness of their spirit and the justice of their rebukes. How far it would

be thought seemly for Unitarians, who are expected, poor patient creatures! to bear all and to retaliate nothing, to use such language as this, I stay not to inquire: I only assert that this was not the language nor the spirit of my reply to my old friend the Old Pupil. My only intention was, in the first place, to resist the charge of misstating even an immaterial fact, and, in the second place, to rally my worthy friend, upon his making a serious business of a trifle, and likewise, upon his imputing to the author words which he never wrote, and then launching out into a confutation of his own error, as though it had been the error of the author. I also warned him against the introduction of names and the revival of old feuds, in which I will not, even now, follow the example either of my friend, or of my friend's advocate. Now, Sir, in all this I am not conscious that I felt the slightest degree of irritation, or expressed myself with any unbecoming asperity of language. Much less could I suspect that I had laid myself open to the charge, not only of a violation of Christian humility, which I well know that our *moderate* friends do not regard as our most shining virtue, but even of common good manners, which some of us are allowed to possess;—and that by this one slip, I had even tarnished the reputation of a long life. But I believe, Sir, that the fact is, that we dealers in controversy do not always know what manner of spirit we are of. And of one thing I am certain, from long and large experience, that our language, however guarded, is liable to be misunderstood, and our intentions, however upright,

to be misjudged. Could I have thought it possible, Mr. Editor, that what was meant as innocent pleasantry, would have been so galling to the feelings of my worthy friend and of his partizans, I would certainly have abstained from it altogether, and would have been as tame, as solemn and as dull, as any of your gentlest readers could desire. But though I am willing to give up raillery, I must not sacrifice truth even in trifles. My assertion was, that Dr. Doddridge's congregation did not chuse as his successor the minister whom he recommended, but another who had a higher reputation for orthodoxy than the Dr. himself. This information and much more, I received from contemporary witnesses, some of whom were actually present at the church-meeting, when the election took place, and who related to me what passed upon the occasion. It is now sixty-two years last November, since Dr. Doddridge died. And my worthy friends, however venerable or respectable at present, were at that time only ten or fifteen years of age: and they must excuse me, if I prefer the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, to their juvenile opinions and puerile recollections. As to what happened ten years afterwards this deponent sayeth nothing.

I now, Sir, take leave of this momentous controversy, and if my worthy friends chuse to write any more upon the subject, they are welcome to keep possession of the field and to exult in their victory. As to myself, though

"Peace is my dear delight, not Fleury's more,"

yet I find, like other and greater men, that the weapons of war,

when once taken up, cannot be laid down at pleasure. Yet still, a foreign war is better than a civil one. And I, with less reluctance, gird on the harness, to encounter the fierce attack of the son of the late Bishop Horsley, who is in great wrath at the review which I have exhibited of his father's controversy with Dr. Priestley, in an Appendix to the *Calm Inquiry*. But though he advances to the combat with all the insolence of a "giant refreshed with wine," I feel great confidence, that if you will indulge me with a few pages, in three or four of your succeeding Repositories, this vaunting Goliath, who sets at defiance the armies of Israel, shall be laid prostrate before the ark, with a sling and a stone, though hurled by an obscure and a feeble hand.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
THOMAS BELSHAM.

Spiritual Supremacy of Jesus Christ; being part of an Address to a Christian Church, in Answer to the Question, "What is it to be a Christian?"

What is it to be a Christian?—"What is it?" replies the conscience of a wicked man,—"*It is to be the reverse of me.*" "*What is it?*" says the heart of a good man, "*It is to be what I wish to be, but what I fear I am not sufficiently.*" "*What is it?*" asks the understanding of every thinking man, "*It is to be what no man can be, by the accident of birth, by inheritance, or by fortune, or without personal reflection and individual exertion.*"

The Christian takes his name from Jesus Christ, who is his chief and leader. He has but this one

master; and his first duty, and the first criterion of his character, is obedience to his Lord. There is no other name set forth by Heaven, to influence our faith and worship and manners. The authority of Jesus is pre-eminent; he is head over all things to the church.

The Christian's obedience to Christ, is not of the nature of Divine worship; on the contrary, it is an act of Christian duty, enjoined by Jesus on all his disciples, to worship God the Father, and him only. Respect to Christ is virtually reverence of God who sent him, and who when he, by a miraculous voice, proclaimed him his Well-beloved Son, commanded all the world to hear him.

It is required of us, as Christians, to receive Christ in the sense in which he lays claim to our regards, that is, (among other respects,) as a spiritual *legislator*, the only one competent to make laws in the Church, which shall be binding on the conscience. He claimed this authority, and God sanctioned his claim; but he delegated it to no one else; he has had, properly speaking, no successor. That, therefore, which he established must be left untouched till the times of reformation, when he shall come with still larger powers than before, and new model and improve even his own economy: that which he ordained not, cannot be imposed by authority on any of his followers. Christians are, as individuals, to exercise their independent judgment upon every religious subject that falls under their cognizance, and Christian societies must, in a great number of cases, regulate their proceedings by their own discretion; but this is a main Christian principle, the

pillar of truth, never to be weakened or undermined, that no man or body of men has any right to impose articles of faith or terms of communion upon his or their brethren, which the head of the church has not enacted,—or even to enforce any that he has clearly enacted, by any other mode than argument and persuasion. No man or church is to be condemned for any tenet conscientiously held; but the moment such man or church attempts to urge that tenet upon me, contrary to my convictions, there is an invasion of my rights, an usurpation of the lordship of Jesus, and it becomes my imperious duty, to resist the attack with Christian weapons, and to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made me free.

Here is the true ground of our dissent from the Church of England and all national churches, antecedently to all inquiry into their doctrines. It matters not whether they mean to establish truth or error; they are, in themselves, radically vicious; they make claims which Christ has never sanctioned, which he has forbidden, and to which no Christian ought to submit. They connect the church with the state, which our Lord has declared separate, in that good confession before Pontius Pilate, which ought to be inscribed on our churches, engraved, as with the pen of a diamond, on a rock for ever;—*My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence.* They make the magistrate or the legislature the judge of truth, which is independent of them, and cannot be helped or hindered by their decisions. They

are connected with formal articles of faith, whereas none such were laid down by our Lord, who has left it the glory of Christianity, that it is not reduced to a creed:—it is the religion of a few plain facts, depending on evidence, requiring no learning to make them clear and no worldly power to enforce them; he that studies them will understand them, and he that believes them and enters into their practical import, is, without and in spite of opulent establishments and officious civil powers, a genuine Christian. They must, once more, be supported and guarded by penal statutes, for I speak the experience of 1500 years, when I say that it is essential to the existence of an hierarchy, to have rewards for right believing and punishments for wrong, immunities and privileges for orthodoxy, disqualifications and disgrace for heresy. But how does this system of things agree with the genius of Christianity, the spirit of Jesus? He, in the days of his flesh, judged and punished no man for his faith or his want of it; but his daring followers have adjudged themselves wiser and more powerful than he, and have usurped an office, that of determining on men's minds and hearts, which he left to his Father.

I shall confine this address to this one point, because it appears to me that the very first principle of a Christian character is the acknowledgment of no authority but Christ's, under God, in matters of religion, and because this all-important principle is from ignorance or from conformity to the world, too little brought forward by those whose religious profession cannot be vindicated without it. It is true that as worshippers of one God,

the Father, only, we should have a good ground of dissent from a Trinitarian established church, if divine authority could be produced for the alliance between church and state; but there being no such authority to be shewn, the first error of an hierarchy, the error of errors, is its being an hierarchy. Its constitution is of little moment; the building itself stands upon stolen ground. No room could have been gained for it, but by direct and grievous encroachment; and therefore, whether the erection be Athanasian or Unitarian in its form, I would equally plead that, according to the declared mind and will of the only Lord of conscience, it ought not to have been set up, but ought, on the contrary, to be taken down with as much haste as is compatible with the safety of those employed in its demolition.

I confess, my brethren, I have not that (as I conceive, misnamed,) candour, which would hold parley with error, and enter into compromise with spiritual wickedness in high places. I would aim to be a faithful subject of the Prince of Life and Lord of Glory, and while I would yield to none in obedience to Cæsar, within his own jurisdiction, I would be the first to denounce and oppose him, when he steps out of it, and invades the province of "another king, one Jesus."

To be a Christian is then, in a word, to call Jesus Lord; to renounce all other authority in religion; and to maintain the interests of his spiritual kingdom. He has given us truth in trust, saying "Occupy till I come;" and miserable will be our feelings and wretched our fate, if in giving an

account of our stewardship, we have to say, "We bartered away the jewel for the phantom reputation, or the thick clay of worldly gain:" or, "We surrendered it up to a worm, lifting its head to power and state." A.

Reflections on a Death-bed.

March 28, 1812.

Sir,

Before I reached my 20th year, I happened to read a celebrated French novel, which is, by the generality of parents, and perhaps with reason, judged unfit and dangerous for the perusal of youth. There is, however, one passage in it with which I was so much delighted, that I wrote it out, and keeping the paper in my pocket-book, read it over and over with undiminished pleasure, through a course of years. Some time ago, I had a dangerous illness, and at a time when I believed my life drawing near its close, I wished again to hear it read, and as it even then seemed equally just and interesting, it appears, as far as my judgment goes, to have a value which justifies my offering it to your readers; many of whom may have neither the wish or opportunity of perusing the work from which it is taken. The heroine of the piece is on her death-bed, and a minister attending her, she thus addresses him:—

"I have lived and I die in the Protestant communion, whose maxims are deduced from scripture and reason; concerning which my heart hath always confirmed what my lips have uttered; and though I may not always have had that docility in regard to your precepts, which perhaps I ought, it has arisen from my aversion to all

kind of hypocrisy: that which I could not believe, I never could profess; I have always sincerely sought what was most conformable to truth and the glory of my Creator. I may have been deceived in my research; not having the vanity to think I have been always in the right. I may, indeed, have been constantly in the wrong; but my intention has been invariably good. This was as much as was in my own power. If God did not vouchsafe to enlighten my understanding farther, he is too merciful and just to demand of me an account of what he has not committed to my care.

"This, Sir, is all I think necessary to say on the opinions I profess. As to the rest, let my present situation answer for me. With my head distracted by illness, and subjected to the delirium of a fever, is it now a proper time to endeavour to reason better than I did in health, when my understanding was unimpaired and as sound as I received it from my Maker?—If I was deceived then, am I less liable to be so now? and in my present weakness does it depend on me to believe otherwise than I did when in full health and strength of body and mind? It is our reason which determines our belief, but mine has lost its best faculties; what dependance then could be made on the opinions I should now adopt without it? What now remains for me to do, is to appeal to what I believed before; for the uprightness of my intention is the same, though I have lost my judgment. If I am in an error, I am sorry for and detest it; and this is sufficient to set my heart at ease as to my belief.

"With respect to my prepara-

tion for death, that, Sir, is made; more when I was in health than at badly, indeed, I own, but it is done in the best manner I could; and at least much better than I can do it now. I endeavoured to discharge that important part of my duty before I became incapable of it. I prayed in health—when I was strong I struggled with divine grace for favour; at present, now I am weak, I am resigned and rely upon it. The best prayers of the sick are patience and resignation. The preparation for death is a good life, I know of no other. While I conversed with you, while I meditated by myself, while I endeavoured to discharge the duties which providence ordained for me; it was then that I was preparing for death, for meeting my God and judge at my last hour. It was then I adored him with all my faculties and powers: what more can I now do, when I have lost them? Is my languid soul in a condition to raise itself to the Almighty? this remnant of a half extinguished life, absorbed in pain, is it worthy of being offered up to God?—no Sir, he leaves it me to employ it for those he taught me to love, and from whom it is his sovereign will that I should now depart; I am going to leave them to go to him; it is, therefore, with them I should now concern myself; I shall soon have nothing to do but with him alone: the last pleasure I take on earth shall be in doing my last duty; is not that to serve him and to do his will; to discharge all those duties which humanity enjoins me, before I throw it off entirely? What have I to do to calm troubles which I have not? my conscience is not troubled; if sometimes it has accused me, it has done it

present. It tells me now that God is more merciful than I am criminal; and my confidence increases as I find my approach nearer to him. I do not present him with an imperfect, tardy or forced repentance, which, dictated by fear, can never be truly sincere, and is only a snare by which the false penitent is deceived. I do not present him with the service of the remnant and latter end of my days, full of pain and sorrow, a prey to sickness, grief, anxiety, death; and which I would not dedicate to his service, till I could do nothing else. No, I present before him my whole life, full, indeed, of errors and faults, but exempt from the remorse of the impious and the crimes of the wicked.

“To what punishment can a just God condemn me? The reprobate, it is said, hate him. Must he not first make me not love him? No, I fear not to be found one of that number. O, thou great eternal Being! Supreme Intelligence! Source of life and happiness! Creator! Preserver! Father! Lord of nature! God, powerful and good, of whose existence I never doubted for a moment, and under whose eye I have ever delighted to live! I know, I rejoice that I am going to appear before thy throne. In a few days my soul, delivered from its earthly tabernacle, shall begin to pay thee, more worthily, that homage which will constitute my happiness to all eternity. I look upon what I shall be till that moment comes, as nothing. My body, indeed, still lives; but my intellectual life is at an end. I am at the end of my career, and am already judged from what is past.

To suffer, to die, is all that I have now to do : and this is nature's work. I have endeavoured to live in such a manner as to have no occasion to concern myself at death, and now it approaches, I see it without fear. Those who sleep in the bosom of a Father, are in no fear of being awaked."

M. H.

A Dialogue on our Obligation to study the Scriptures, and to act on the Motives which they prescribe, even though their Divine Origin should be uncertain.

A.—You tell me that you find yourself able to avoid all gross offences, all sensual indulgences, all sorts of debauchery, and, you believe, every instance of cruelty and injustice ; that you perform as many acts of benevolence as you think consistent with your circumstances ; in short, that you act up to all the obligations of morality, and that your conscience does not reproach you with any crimes performed, nor with any duties omitted. You profess yourself satisfied with such conduct, and not only with your conduct, (which is, indeed, more free from vice than that of almost any body I know,) but also with the motive that gives birth to it, though you confess that you are living in great ignorance of the scriptures, and do not *pretend* to any *higher* incitement to good, nor think any *higher* motive necessary to your salvation than the wish of promoting the welfare of your fellow men. You say, what could I better, if I acted on scripture motives ? If I found myself unable to abstain from the commission of evil, or indisposed to do good, I would then

seek for some new motive of action ; —I would then search the scriptures ? But so long as I feel no such deficiency in myself, I cannot see the necessity for better principles than those I possess. What tie is there on me to search the scriptures ? To do so may be a dangerous experiment. It may stagger me in my present way of thinking, without giving me any power of adopting a better. It may deprive me of the satisfaction I at present feel, whilst it cannot inspire me with a more perfect self-complacency. What can I do better than well ? What assurance of doing well can I have stronger than the self-satisfaction I now feel ? God has implanted conscience in our breasts, as a sure guide to right conduct ; a certain, and never-failing test, by which to estimate our actions justly. By that test I have examined mine ; and I repeat that it decides in my favour. What can I wish for more ? What surer evidence can I have of my own safety ?*

Such is the language which you hold to me, and the substance of it is, "What tie is there on me to study the scriptures ?" This I will answer, by enquiring what is the crime of not doing it ?

Suppose that some time after the death of a very dear friend, your instructor and guide, whom you had loved for his virtues and revered for his wisdom, there should appear in the world a book, which was reported to be the production of his pen. Suppose that the greater part of the world should have agreed to attribute it

* The reader will see in this language something of the spirit of Hume.

to him; that a very *great* proportion of the best and wisest men you know, should declare the evidence in favour of his having written it, to be very strong and convincing. Suppose that you could scarcely mix in any society where serious subjects were discussed, without hearing this book referred to, as one of uncommon excellence and the composition of your former intimate. Should you not think yourself the most unreasonable of all beings, if, without examining into the testimony which declared against such an opinion, you decided that the book in question was *not* the production of your friend. But this injustice you are guilty of towards God, if you declare your disbelief of the divine origin of the scriptures, without having examined into the evidence which is brought forward to *prove* their origin divine. This, however, is a piece of blind injustice that I trust you are not so irrational as to be guilty of. To come more immediately to your own case:—Should you not think that you paid the memory of your deceased friend a very ill compliment, if you gave yourself no trouble to ascertain, whether this so much talked of book was really his production? If you neglected to examine into either the evidence that offered itself to you from without, or its *internal* evidence of genuineness? Yet this insult do you offer to God if you neglect to examine all the proofs that can be adduced of the truth of holy writ.

Further, after having been persuaded to investigate the evidence, and having convinced yourself that the book in question did indeed come from the hand of your

lamented instructor, should you not be most anxious to drink deep of his doctrines; to instruct yourself in his sentiments; to conform to the advice, and catch the spirit of the man, whose opinion you had been accustomed so much to reverence? Should you not confidently presume that the instructions of that man whom you had known to be so good and so wise, must be wholesome and profitable? Should you not think it almost criminal, if, with such means of improvement in your reach, you neglected to seize them? Yet this criminal neglect you are guilty of towards God, your best and kindest friend, when, believing that the scriptures are his word, you neglect to study them.

B.—As to the genuineness or authenticity of the scriptures, I am not disposed to dispute about them. If they are true, I think that they were written for the use of such only as feel the want of them; such as cannot curb their passions without them. I, whether constitutionally without strong passions, or from any other cause, feel no such want. I have therefore, no stimulus to enquire into the force of those proofs which you so often press upon me. The scriptures may or may not be true, I have never yet taken the trouble seriously to scrutinize them, nor—

A.—There let me stop you. By confessing that the scriptures *may* be true, you condemn yourself as a rational being. If the scriptures *may* be true, then you *may* (as if they are true you certainly will) be condemned for not acting in all you do from that motive, which they prescribe as the only one that will be accepted; the only one by which any deed can be

sanctified, or find favour in the eyes of our Maker. If you would take the trouble to *read* the scriptures, you would find them declaring throughout, the absolute necessity of acting from this motive, which is the desire of pleasing God in every thing that we undertake. And it is nothing to call in question the justice of God's requiring such motive from us: he had a right to prescribe to men what terms he pleased, and it is not for us to object to them, unless we think fit to set our own wisdom against omniscience; and even though we were disposed so to do, still, unless we were also able to set our power against that of the Almighty, unless we could overcome omnipotence, we shall find our only safety in obedience.*

From what I have said, then, it is obvious that you *may* incur some danger by neglecting the scriptures—a danger no less than the possibility of incurring eternal punishment. Now, by making them the rule of your life, you at least run no sort of risk; if they do no good, they can do no harm. If, as to man, all things end with this life; or if a strict compliance with scriptural injunctions will give us no claim to future reward; if we are to enjoy eternal bliss without such compliance; or if we are never to enjoy it at all;—still, in any case, you will not be the worse off, for having been guided by the gospel. Nobody will say, that it is *bad*, or *dangerous*, and that obedience to it will render us

fit objects of *punishment*. But if that word be true which declares that they shall incur eternal misery who act not according to its spirit and decrees, or who act agreeably to those decrees from any other than the motive prescribed, viz. the desire of obeying God; if, I say, this be the real state of the case, do but consider for a moment what he will draw upon himself who has dared to neglect the scripture terms of salvation. Think how irrationally and improvidently he acts, who chooses rather to go on in a course of life which may or may not be punished with the greatest conceivable misery, than to live in that state in which he is certainly safe! How would such conduct be condemned in worldly matters! How much would a minister (however well meaning) be censured for his stupidity, who, when he might adopt such measures as would *infallibly* defend his country from the attacks of its enemy, should yet resort to those which left its safety uncertain. You say, that you are satisfied with yourself and that you cannot acknowledge the necessity of any better motive to action than that which influences you. But if you acknowledge that the scriptures *may* be true, and also grant (which you must do, if you examine them) that those scriptures make the wish to serve God, the only saving motive of our conduct; you must then allow, that, by acting from any *other* motive, you *may* incur eternal punishment.

And with respect to conscience, you misrepresent the fact. Conscience is *not* a faculty of itself sufficient to lead us to a *perfect* knowledge of what actions are

* If the case were otherwise than as it is,—if we were to be rewarded or punished as our constitutional propensities to moral good or evil differ, then indeed, we might, with some shew of reason, call in question the justice of God.

right and what wrong. Conscience is the testimony of reason deciding for or against us; "accusing or excusing us;" but as our reason is imperfect, so the decision which it gives, i. e. the judgment of conscience must sometimes be wrong. Conscience did not teach the ancients that revenge was a crime; it would not have taught you so, unless your reason be stronger and more perfect than theirs, which you will scarcely affirm it to be. It is true you *do* know and acknowledge that revenge is a crime; but *how* do you know it? Through those very scriptures which you yet think not of the first moment. By no other means, through no other channel, could the discovery be made; there is no other moral or religious code which holds the same doctrine.

It appears then, my dear friend, that we require some better guide than mere reason or conscience, and we know that the best and wisest men have, for many ages, agreed to acknowledge the scriptures as this guide; let us then ask ourselves, if it be not the height of pride and self-sufficiency to reject, without the strictest examination, or even to neglect, that which so many better and wiser men have believed and acted on. Let us not venture to sit down satisfied with any other motives than those which the gospel exacts, till we have convinced ourselves, by the most irrefragable arguments, and the most indubitable proofs, that we are safe in so doing. Otherwise we act the part of the stupid minister before mentioned, with this aggravation of the case, that whereas he could but incur for his folly the vengeance of man, and that for a very short period,

we may be exposing ourselves to the wrath of God for all eternity. I will make use of one other argument to shew the injustice that you do, both to yourself and to God, by not studying the scriptures. Let us suppose, that you wished to perfect yourself in mathematics; would you not take some trouble to ascertain the readiest means of so doing? As, for instance, how to find out the best masters, how to possess yourself of the best books, in short, so far as your means went, how to procure every convenience for the ready and certain attainment of your end? Now you must and do, I am sure, think it the most desirable thing in the world, to know and practise the best method of securing the favour and approbation of your Maker: and yet you neglect, entirely neglect, that book which professes to teach the best, nay, the *only* means of gaining an end the most important that you can possibly have in view. And this indifference you manifest, even though the best and wisest men declare their belief, that the said book can do all it professes. You confess, that it behoves all men to serve God acceptably, and yet you neglect those rules of conduct, which, if you were to ask the first man that you meet in the street for a spiritual guide, he would direct you to, as best calculated to answer your end, and written for that very purpose. Thus then you are not half so anxious to promote your eternal welfare, as you would be to perfect yourself in mathematics; nor a hundredth part so much interested in a question which relates to your everlasting happiness or misery, as I have seen you in some

political dispute, the subject of Hume's was a miserable death-bed." This celebrated female writer, I presume, is the author of *Practical Piety*, the nineteenth chapter of which work has for its title "Happy Deaths," and, after examining as much of it as relates to the subject at issue, I can affirm, that the statement of your "Constant Reader" is inadvertently exaggerated. Mrs. M. does not "labour all in her power to convince us, that Hume's was a miserable death-bed." She does indeed endeavour to shew (with what success let others judge) that the closing scene of "this eminent historian and philosopher" might not be in truth so happy as is represented by his friend Dr. Adam Smith. But she is far from asserting that it was wretched. They are the dying horrors of "the sage of Ferney" on which she expatiates: in the case of Mr. Hume, she was unable to discover any thing which resembled them.

Hume and Mrs. Hannah More.

SIR, February 3, 1813.

I agree with *A Constant Reader* (pp. 32, 33) that the fear of being left in solitude and darkness may happen to possess the minds even of the firmest believers in revelation: I further admit, that examples, such as those alleged by the writers on whom he animadverts, should be very cautiously adduced and very temperately applied; and, lastly, I join him in condemning the style and tone in which "many zealots of the present day" speak of the deaths of those of "their fellow creatures" who have not subscribed to the evidences of Christianity. Christianity, doubtless, is ill defended by the reasonings which these men employ and by the spirit which they exercise in its vindication.

Coinciding thus far with your correspondent, I beg permission to point out what I take to be an inaccuracy in the following sentence of his letter:

"A celebrated female writer, in a recent work, has laboured all in her power to convince us, that

A Constant Reader might, with greater justice, have complained of Mrs. M. for her treatment of the author of "The Wealth of Nations."—After strongly censuring what she regards as his *extravagant* eulogium on Hume, she says of this "eloquent panegyrist,"

"With as insidious an innuendo as has ever been thrown out against revealed religion, he goes on to observe, that *perhaps it is one of the very worst circumstances against Christianity, that very few of its professors were ever either so moral, so humane, or could so philosophically govern their passions, as the sceptical David Hume.*"

Now, Sir, although these words

may, I suppose, be found in the earlier editions of Dr. Smith's Letter to the late Mr. Strahan, *they are wanting in the recent impressions of it* ;* from which circumstance we may fairly infer, that the writer had judged proper to suppress them, and, consequently, that they should not be used as the materials of a charge against his memory.

There was much to be admired in the *virtues* of Mr. Hume as a man, and in his *talents* as a writer. However, let me not be accused of bigotry, if I venture to suggest, that his character might have been yet more exemplary, his last moments yet happier and more instructive, had he taken the Christianity of the New Testament for the rule of his life and the charter of his hope.

Yours, &c. N.

Cases of Thomas Aikenhead and Paul Best.

SIR, February 7, 1813.

I can offer *Bidellianus*, (p. 17.) but little additional information respecting the case of *Aikenhead*. The following is, however, at his service.

I have an 18mo volume, entitled, *Institutions of the Criminal Law of Scotland, for the use of the Students who attend the Lectures of Alexander Bayne, J.P. [Juris Professor.]* Edinburgh, 1748.

At page 5, are the following passages, under the title *Blasphemy*:

"According to our written law, the punishment of *blasphemy* is death: and the *first* species there-

* Even in the edition of 1782, eight years before Dr. Smith's death.

of consists in the railing upon, or cursing God, that is, uttering imprecations against the *Almighty*, (unless the offender is under the power of madness) without distinction whether he continues in the practice of it or not; for the *single act* constitutes the crime. The *second* consists in the denying the existence of the Supreme Being or any of the persons of the blessed Trinity, and therein persevering obstinately to the last; for reiterated denial does not fully constitute the crime, because the statute admits of repentance before conviction, as a complete expiation. *Act 21. Parl. 1. Sess. 1. Charles II.*

"This *Act*, 1661, is ratified by *Act 11. Sess. 5. K. William*. And it is farther thereby provided, that none shall, either in discourse or writing, call in question the existence of God or any of the persons of the Trinity, or the authority of the *scriptures*, or the *Divine Providence* in the government of the Universe. And that the punishment of the *first* offence shall be imprisonment, till satisfaction given by public repentance in sackcloth. Of the *second*, a fine of a year's valued rent of the real estate and a twentieth part of the personal estate. The trial of both which is competent to the inferior judges. That the punishment of the *third* offence shall be death, to be tried only by the *justices*. Upon these two Acts we had one noted trial, in the case of *Thomas Aikenhead*, anno 1696, who was thereupon convicted and executed." One of your correspondents in Scotland can probably gain access to, and give some account of the *noted trial* here mentioned by the Professor.

In England, the latest instance I have found of persecution unto death, by the executioner, (if the punishment were really inflicted,) occurred in 1645, to the indelible disgrace of the Long Parliament. I quote the following passage from their own historian and one of their most eminent members, *Whitelock*. Mem. (Ed. 1732.) P. 190.

"1645, Jan. 28, The day of the monthly fast. In the evening the house met, and heard a report from the Committee of Plundered Ministers, of the blasphemies of one *Paul Best*, who denied the Trinity of the Godhead, and the Deity of Christ and the Holy Ghost. The House ordered him to be kept close prisoner, and an Ordinance to be brought in, to punish him with death." To these new forcers of conscience, who could thus prepare themselves by a fast, not to let the oppressed go free, but to smite with the fist of wickedness, Milton might well say,

*Because you have thrown off your prelate
lord
And with stiff vows renounc'd his Liturgy,
Dare ye, for this, adjure the civil sword
To force our consciences, that Christ set
free.*

I know not any instance of juridical enormity which exceeds, and very few which equal, this design, to destroy a prisoner by an *ex post facto* law. Yet I doubt whether this Ordinance were really passed; for I find the Assembly of Divines, in their sanguinary attempt against *Biddle*, obliged to "solicite the Parliament, and procure a Draconic Ordinance (May 2, 1648), for inflicting the punishment of death upon those that held opinions contrary to the Presbyterian points, about the Trinity and other doc-

trines, whom they named blasphemers and hereticks." Thus writes the author of *A short Account of the Life of John Biddle, M. A. sometimes of Magdalene Hall, Oxon.* (P. 5, in Unit. Tracts, 4to. 1691.) I shall be much obliged to any of your readers, who will communicate, or refer me to, a further account of *Paul Best* and the story of his persecution.

R.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

SIR,

As you have lately given your readers a very interesting account of the expulsion of a worthy member of the Society of "Friends" (no longer it seems, as they were formerly thought, to liberty and free enquiry), for questioning the doctrine of the Trinity, it may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to many of your readers to learn, from the following document, what sort of a Trinity it is, which at least some highly accredited members of this Society profess to believe. I was furnished with it by a Friend who had questioned my right to consider myself a Christian, because I was understood not to believe in the Divinity of Christ; and to whom I had answered, that, if by Divinity was meant "Divine commission and authority," I believed it as firmly as any person:—but, that if this term meant "essential Deity, equality with the Father," I certainly did not believe it, nor could I conceive that any person could prove such a doctrine from the scriptures. My friend declined entering into any explanations, observing that it was not the prac-

tice of their Society to engage in theological controversy; but requested some short and simple exposition of my general notions; expressing, at the same time, no great reluctance to give the Quaker-creed in return. Accordingly, I sent Dr. Priestley's Appeal, with Elwall's Trial appended to it; which last I thought would be likely to be read by him with particular interest on account of the author's partial connection with the Society of Friends. In return I received the following paper:—

“On the Unity of the Godhead, under the different Appellations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.”

“The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not three distinct persons or essences, but essentially and identically one and the same, each signifying the one true God, and not collectively implying a composition or aggregate, in the essentiality of the Divinity. For he is a pure, simple, perfect Being, independently supreme, without parts and without mixture, incapable of addition or diminution, having in himself inherently and incomprehensibly all possible perfection.

“The different appellations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit are, nevertheless, not to be used indifferently or indiscriminately one for another, because they are properly and consistently used only, as this one supreme, self-existing essence is considered in different points of view.

“For when considered as the great First Cause of all things, from whence the whole universe of animate and inanimate creation solely derives its origin and existence, he

is very expressively and significantly called the Father.

“When he is considered as acting in and actuating his creatures, and administering unto them such suitable helps as their situations in the scale of existence requires, more especially in this spiritual and substantial dispensation, he is then with equal propriety termed the Son.

“Again, as he measurably acts in the hearts of men individually, in reproving and correcting them for every impurity of action and intention, in manifesting in them, with convincing, self-evident and undeniable clearness, the path that leads to eternal blessedness with himself; and in enabling them, by the influence of mercy, love and strength, to walk and persevere steadily therein, during this scene of mutability and change, he is justly denominated the Spirit, with the emphatical epithet of Holy.”

Whether this is an extract from some authorized Quaker-creed, or from the works of some approved writer of that respectable Christian sect, or whether it is an original production, I know not. If either of the former, perhaps some of your correspondents can point it out. But it was surely a needless exertion of inquisitorial power, first to catechise, and then to expel, an eminent and long-valued member of their body, for impugning the Trinitarian doctrine, if they had no better form of it to uphold than this.—It is, at best, a mere *modal* Trinity, explicitly disavowing the idea of “three distinct Persons or Essences;” in short, it is like all the modifications of what is usually called the Sabellian scheme, supplying a pretence for the use of

orthodox language, while the real doctrine is strictly Unitarian. But, in fact, it is not even modally Trinitarianism, but Dualism; with this difference from the Dualism of the immediate successor of the "apostate" Robinson, (as his successor in the second degree,* it seems, makes no scruple to call him), that, whereas, the Hallian creed is understood to discard the Spirit, this creed appears to discard the Son; and if it can be called a Trinity at all, it is composed of the Father and two Spirits; not a word is used under the second head, that can be supposed to have the remotest reference to the history, doctrine, death or resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But to leave this, will you permit me, Mr. Editor, to take the opportunity which the above related incident affords me, of expressing my regret that the Antitrinitarians should have been so ready to join issue with their opponents as to admit that they "deny the Divinity of Christ." Divinity is a scholastic term, well understood by thorough-paced theologians; but, by the bulk of English readers, its denial is, I believe, very generally considered as a denial of the divine commission and authority of Christ. Many times have I been obliged to remove this stumbling-block from the threshold of the excellent tract of Dr. Priestley's, referred to above, when first put into the hands of persons in other respects not indisposed to admit the Unitarian doctrine; and if I were a member of the Committee of the

London Book Society, I should be strongly tempted to move that the word "Deity" should be substituted for "Divinity," in the title-page of the next edition.

I am, &c.

N. C.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.—Letter VI.

SIR, Jan. 3, 1818.

I am disposed, by your permission, to bring down nearer to our times the *Sketch of English Protestant Persecution*, begun in your last volume [pp. 38, 218, 301, 362, 436]. To this attempt I am more inclined by observing, with regret, the zeal with which Protestants are now encouraging each other, under the pretence of maintaining a Protestant ascendancy, to perpetuate Protestant persecution; not, indeed, the persecution of the stake or the dungeon, but the milder vexation of disfranchisement and disability.

My last letter ended with the reign of Edward the Sixth. I should now proceed to notice the spirit of Protestant persecution, discovered by Elizabeth and those who participated in civil power during her reign. But I have previously a debt of justice to discharge, towards the memory of a foreign scholar and divine, in his age, almost singularly enlightened on the subject of religious liberty, and whose sentiments as peculiarly applicable to the persecution under Edward the Sixth, should have been quoted in a former letter, had I been then aware of them. The person I mean is *Sebastian Castellio*. Looking, very lately, into his Latin version of the Bible, I observed that he

* See *Apostacy*, a Sermon, by F. A. Cox, M. A.

had addressed the work to Edward the Sixth, in a prefatory dedication. This was dated from *Basil, February, 1551.*

He begins by detailing the arguments which his friends had urged, for dedicating his version to the king:—that his kingdom had been an asylum to the persecuted for the study of the scriptures: that the king himself had promoted a version of the scriptures, a design interrupted by the death of a scholar (not named):—that Edward, besides other literature, had peculiarly cultivated the *Latin* tongue, under a most learned tutor.

Castellio, after describing the design of his version, and the principle and conduct of his translation, proceeds to consider the religious dissensions of his time. These he resolves into an ignorance of divine truth, which he attributes to an irreligious spirit. After a long and highly appropriate enumeration of prophetic scriptures, describing the peace and virtue of gospel times, he inquires if these predictions have been yet accomplished. Proceeding to his own time, he sarcastically *admires* that peace which forms swords out of scythes and ploughshares, and converts houses and their utensils into guns and bulwarks.—He then thus laments the rancour displayed by rival polemics, and the frequency of religious persecution, by the aid of the civil power, designing, as I suppose, especially to condemn *Protestant* persecution, by his frequent repetition of the phrase *studio Christi*:—

“Perhaps this peace abides with the learned masters of the people. Whence then the strife of tongues and pens, more pernicious

than that of the sword? Whence the grievous controversies which cannot be decided even in these disputations times, and generally end in the destruction of the weaker party, while there is no one who is diffident of his own opinion, or who hesitates to condemn the opinion of another. We envy, we calumniate, we not only retaliate evils, but often return evil for good. If any one differ from us, though on some inconsiderable article of faith, we anathematise him and pursue him into every corner of the land, with the hostility of the tongue and the pen. We persecute with fire, water and the sword, and thus hurry out of the world, the destitute and defenceless. We declare it unlawful for *us* to kill. We, therefore, deliver to Pilate, and if he dismiss his prisoner, we say he is not *Cæsar’s* friend. But what is most abominable, we profess to act thus by the example and command, and in the name of Christ. Thus we conceal under the skin of a lamb, the ferocity of the wolf. O what times! Do we become sanguinary by the example of Christ, who, that the blood of others should not be shed, poured out his own? Do we extirpate the tares by the example of Christ, who, lest the wheat should be destroyed, commanded, that the tares should remain to the harvest? Do we persecute by the example of Christ, who commanded, if any one smite us on the right side, to turn to him the left? Do we injure others by the example of Christ, who commanded *us* to return good for evil?”

After inquiring where was to be found the *charity* celebrated by Paul, referring the king to ex-

amples of Judas Machabæus and Moses, and warning him in the words of *Gamaliel* and of Paul, concerning him that is weak in the faith. Castellio thus returns to a subject he had before treated:—"Let us obey the righteous judge, and leave the tares till the harvest, lest, while we would be wiser than the master, we destroy the wheat." He happily adds,—“Neither is this the end of the world, nor are we the angels to whom that province is committed.” He then enlarges on the absurdity of waging a spiritual warfare with the weapons of this world. Having described that warfare, he proceeds to make a very just distinction between the obvious and highly important duties of a magistrate, and his affected *cure of souls*.

Having stated the inconsistency of mixing in society with Turks and Jews, and men of all characters, and, at the same time, prosecuting virtuous, if differing, Christians, Castellio enlarges on the civil impolicy of persecution. He then closes, with the best wishes for the young king, of whom he professes, though he has addressed him in such terms, to have heard nothing amiss. He evidently regarded Edward, now in his 14th year, as not in the exercise of government, but in a condition of pupillage, *sub tutorum cura*. It is remarkable that he makes no reference, throughout this Dedication, to the then governors of church and state, in this country. He must have heard of the sufferings of Joan Bocher, and of the spirit betrayed by Cranmer and his associates. To counteract that spirit, in the mind of the young king, was, I apprehend, the chief design of this Dedication.

VOL. VIII.

We have seen (vol. vii. p. 436, 437) Calvin recommending persecution unto death to Edward's governors. The Reformer of Geneva could not fail to hate Castellio, *with perfect hatred*. His forbearance and his faith must have been equally offensive. According to Dr. Chandler, in his *History of Persecution*, (p. 312, in *Memoirs of Socinus*, p. 74) Calvin addressed Castellio with these harsh greetings,—“Blasphemer, reviler, malicious barking dog, full of ignorance, bestiality and impudence, impostor, a base corrupter of the sacred writings, a mocker of God, a contemner of all religion, an impudent fellow, a filthy dog, a knave, an impudent, lewd, crooked-minded vagabond, beggerly rogue, a disciple and brother of Servetus, and an Heretic.” Dr. Chandler adds, “Castellio's reply to all these flowers is worthy the patience and moderation of a Christian, and from his slanderer he appeals to the righteous judgment of God.”

In the next letter, I shall attempt to ascertain the character of Elizabeth's reign, as it respects the subject of this *Sketch*. That princess will, I believe, be found to deserve a higher station than historians have generally assigned her, among Protestant persecutors.

R. G. S.

A Quere.

SIR,

The reduced, fast-decaying sect of old Thirty-nine, or, at least a plurality of its remaining members, (ridiculously enough, indeed, but in spite, it is to be feared, rather than mistake,) persist in calling us by the name of *Socinians*. What

would their poor Rump aggregate think and say of us, were we in return to designate them by the far more characteristic appellation of *Cranmerites*?

TE TACE.

JOHN MILTON.

Unus Patronus bonæ causæ satis est.
EPISCOPIUS.

No. XV.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Functions.

Then both commonwealth and religion will, at length, if ever, flourish in Christendom, when either they who govern discern between civil and religious, or they only who so discern shall be admitted to govern*.

No. XVI.

Female Society.

No mortal nature can endure, either in the actions of religion or study of wisdom, without sometime slackening the cords of intense thought and labour: which lest we should think faulty, God himself conceals us not his own recreations before the world was built; I was, saith the eternal Wisdom, *daily his delight, playing always before him*. And to him, indeed, wisdom is as a high tower of pleasure, but to us a steep hill, and we toying ever about the bottom: he executes with ease the exploits of his omnipotence, as easie as with us it is to will:—

* The same thought is thus expressed in the Sonnet to Sir H. Vane:

"Both spiritual pow'r and civil, what each means,

"What severs each, thou well hast learn'd, which few have done."

but no worthy enterprise can be done by us, without continual plodding and wearisomenes to our faint and sensitive abilities. We cannot, therefore, always be contemplative or pragmatistical abroad, but have need of some delightful intermissions, wherein the enlarged soul may leave off a while her severe schooling; and like a glad youth in wandering vacancy, may keep her holidays to joy and harmless pastime: which as she cannot well do without company, so in no company so well as where the different sex, in most resembling unlikeness, and most unlike resemblance, cannot but please best, and be pleased in the aptitude of that variety.

No. XVII.

The Fathers.

Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubbs, unpickt, unchosen, those are the Fathers.

No. XVIII.

Form of Prayer.

What if it be granted to the infirmity of some ministers, (though such seem to be rather half-ministers) to help themselves with a set form, shall it therefore be urged upon the plenteous graces of others? And let it be granted to some people, while they are babes in Christian gifts, were it not better to take it away soon after, as we do loitering books and *interlineary* translations from children?

No. XIX.

Happiness of a People.

He [Cha. I.] would work the people to a persuasion, that if he be miserable they cannot be happy. What should hinder them? Were they all born twins of Hippocrates with him and his fortune, one birth, one burial? It were a nation miserable indeed, not worth the name of a nation, but a race of ideots, whose happiness and welfare depended upon one man. The happiness of a nation consists in true religion, piety, justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude, and in the contempt of avarice and ambition. They, in whomsoever these virtues dwell eminently, need not kings to make them happy, but are the architects of their own happiness; and whether to themselves or others, are not less than kings.

No. XX.

Heretic.

He who to his best apprehension follows the scripture, though against any point of doctrine, by the whole church received, is not the heretic; but he who follows the church against his conscience and persuasion, grounded on the scripture.

He is the only heretic who counts all heretics but himself.

No. XXI.

Irregularity.

That is not always best which is most regular to written law. Great worthies heretofore, by disobeying law, oft-times have saved the commonwealth; and the law afterward, by firm decree, hath approved that planetary motion, that unblameable exorbitancy in them.

No. XXII.

The Divine Law.

The hidden ways of his providence we adore and search not, but the law is his revealed will, his compleat, his evident, his certain will; herein he appears to us, as it were, in human shape, enters into covenant with us, swears to keep it, binds himself like a just Lawgiver, to his own prescriptions, gives himself to be understood by men, judges and is judged, measures and is commensurate to the right reason; cannot require less of us in one cantle of his law than in another; his legal justice cannot be so fickle and variable, sometimes like a devouring fire, and by and by connivent in the embers, or, if I may so say, oscitant and supine. The vigour of his law could no more remit, than the hallowed fire upon his altar could be let go out. The lamps that burned before him might need snuffing, but the light of his law never.

No. XXIII.

Liberty of Conscience.

Give me the liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties.

No. XXIV.

Liberty of Person.

And not to have in ourselves, though vaunting to be free-born, the power of our own freedom, and the public safety, is a degree lower than not to have the property of our own goods. For liberty of person and the right of self-preservation is much nearer, much more natural and more worth to all men, than the propriety of their goods and wealth.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

On the Use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship.

[Continued from p. 47.]

Briefly to recapitulate. Ἀδω (*ado*) is clearly appropriated to the act of singing. ὕμνεω (*hymneo*) signifies to praise or celebrate, more especially, as it appears, by singing or repeating metrical compositions. Ψάλλω (*psallo*) signifies to play on stringed instruments, to sing and at the same time play on instruments, to praise by such singing and playing.

I now proceed to consider the passages in which these words occur, excepting those only in which the word *psalm* is used in reference to the Book of Psalms, (viz. Luke xx. 42. xxiv. 41. Acts i. 26. xiii. 33) which need no explanation.

1. Acts xvi. 25. "And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises to God." The original (προσευχόμενοι ὕμνον) may probably be thus rendered; but the more natural meaning is, 'prayed and praised God,' and so Schleusner translates it. Hammond* renders it, "Paul and Silas in their office of prayer used a hymn." Indeed if the idea of a critic in your Repository be correct,† the original makes the act

of prayer cotemporary with the act of uttering praises; and, at any rate, the *literal* rendering is, 'praying gave praises to God,' which is very commonly done in our devotional services. There is something uncommonly interesting in the use of the animated expression of thanksgiving by singing in such circumstances; and I do not think it impossible that the apostle and his companion really did sing; but this is not said; and I presume we should not think less highly of their praise, if it proved to have been certainly unaccompanied with vocal melody.

2. Romans xv. 9. "As it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name." "The original word *psalo*," says Macknight (who, as a Scotch divine, could have no prepossession in favour of instrumental music) "signifies to praise God with the voice accompanied with instrumental music." The passage is quoted from the Septuagint version of Psalm xviii. 49, where the Hebrew word is *zemer* (see the first note on Ψάλλω); and it cannot be doubted, I think, that the Psalmist's object was rather the praise than the manner of the praise; but as far as the manner

* Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms.

† Primitivus (Monthly Rep. Vol. V. p. 190.) maintains, "that the present participle of the Greek language, without the article, when joined to a verb, and agreeing with the subject of that verb, ever refers to a time simultaneous with the time signified by the verb."

If this canon be *universal*, then the praying and the praising could not be two distinct acts, at least so far as they must have been on the common interpretation of the passage. I have no doubt it is the general usage, and therefore content myself with saying, that "praying gave praises to God" is the natural and *literal* rendering.

is brought into view, the Alexandrian translators must have considered him as intending the use of singing with instrumental accompaniments. This indeed appears to have been the constant habit of David when uttering his psalms of praise. As the praise certainly is the leading object of the writer, and we have no word in our language which will denote praise by singing with instruments, I see no objection to translating it somewhat loosely, "I will acknowledge thee among the nations, I will publicly utter praises unto thy name." But if we think it best to employ words denoting the manner of the praise, in order to give the real force of the word, we must take care to avoid confining it to singing with the voice, exclusively of instruments, which the word does not signify.

3. 1 Cor. xiv. 15. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing (*psalo*) with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also." We are here unable to employ a mode of explanation which was of assistance in the last passage. As it is not a translation from the Hebrew, we seem almost compelled to take the word in the sense in which, without restraint from another language, it would be understood by the Corinthian Christians. The apostle is rectifying the abuse of their spiritual gifts, too common in their public assemblies; and this verse shews what he would himself have done in their circumstances, and what of course he wished them to do. Their devotional expressions were not only to be prompted by the spirit, but to be under the guidance of the

understanding. So far is clear, the only question is, what does the apostle mean when he uses the word *ψαλω* (*psalo*)? That the praise was the chief object cannot be doubted; but if he had meant praise without any reference to the manner of it, the Greek language supplied him with sufficient variety. If he referred to singing, to the exclusion of instrumental accompaniment, he had a word which he elsewhere employs, decidedly appropriated to singing. He was writing to a community consisting chiefly (see Acts xviii. 6) of Gentile converts, accustomed while heathens to the use of instrumental music in their religious services, and residing in a city in which the arts were much studied and practised, a city of excessive luxury and refinement; and he employed a word peculiarly appropriated among the Greeks (when used in connection with music) to playing on instruments, or singing with instrumental accompaniment, and never used, in those days, for singing alone. *Psallo* does mean, I allow, to praise God (by singing with instrumental accompaniments); but it does not mean to praise God in any other way. The use of it would not have been admissible in reference to praise in general; I may say with confidence (as far as my present means of judgment enable me to decide, and I have sought for all I know of), that it would have been inadmissible in reference to singing without instruments, and still more so if the apostle had meant to exclude the use of instrumental accompaniments in devotional singing. The praise is here, of course, the chief object, as in the former passage,

but less exclusively, than in that, of the manner; yet, as we have no word fully corresponding to *psallo*, I should think it preferable to employ a more general term than *singing*, as the translation of it; since this, in our common use of it, and through particular associations in the minds of many (especially in reference to devotional exercises), almost implies the *absence* of instrumental accompaniments, which the original was so far from doing that it never meant singing exclusively. "I will praise with the spirit, I will praise with the understanding also," is rather a clumsy rendering, but if it does not convey the whole truth, it conveys nothing but the truth, which (through very common associations) will not be found to be the case with the expression, "I will sing," &c.

Are we then to suppose, that the Corinthians, when under the inspiration of the spirit they uttered the psalm of praise in their public assemblies, not only employed vocal melody, but accompanied the voice with instrumental music; that even the apostle Paul himself in such circumstances would have done so? The question at first considerably startled me, as it probably may some of your readers. I had long been accustomed to suppose, that the New Testament, if it does not condemn, at least furnishes no authority for the use of instrumental music in devotional exercises, whether public or private. And it is not without great hesitation, arising from old impressions, and from the earnest desire to avoid error myself, or leading others into error, that I answer those questions in the affirmative.

But I do not see how the conclusion can be avoided till it has been shewn (and I know of no authority for it) that the word $\Psi\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\varsigma$ (*psallo*) would in the apostle's times have been understood by the Corinthians to mean singing *exclusively* or even *alone*. We must not judge of these things by our own ideas and manners. To us it appears strange, that the spirit-prompted effusions of devotion should be accompanied with instrumental music. To the Quakers it appears strange that they should be uttered even with vocal melody. Let us place ourselves back in the time and place referred to, and we shall find a wide difference. Music was a regular and even essential branch of education among the polished Greeks; their regular precomposed poetry, and even the unpremeditated effusions of genius, were sung with instrumental accompaniments; their hymns of praise to the Gods were accompanied with the harp or lyre. If the Gentile converts were not *forbidden* to use instrumental accompaniments with their spiritual songs, they would use them as a matter of course. Their music was extremely simple, and the lyre might be made to yield harmonious sounds without an effort of attention. They had abundant authority for the use of the harp, the psaltery, &c. in connexion with some of the finest specimens of devotional expression that ever were committed to writing. What should prevent the Corinthian Christian, when the spirit prompted the psalm of praise, from singing it to his lyre or psaltery? What should prevent the apostle? He was brought up in the schools of Tar-

sus, in all the learning of Greece; and music was a study even of the philosophers. He speaks of the beggarly elements of the law, but he does not class instrumental accompaniments among them, nor indeed could he, for they could not form a part of the Mosaic ritual. I will cheerfully retract the assertion if adequate reasons against it are produced; but till that is done, I must maintain that the passage under consideration fully authorizes the use of instrumental accompaniments, equally as much as vocal melody in uttering the psalm of praise in the public assemblies of the Christians.

I have only further to observe on the passage, that singing in the Christian assemblies at Corinth, was (as far as can be gathered from this epistle) nothing more than the act of an individual, singing (with instrumental accompaniments) what the spirit prompted, either at the time, or previously to their meeting together. "Here it may be observed," says Locke, "that as in their public prayers, one prayed and the others held their peace, so it was in their singing, at least in that singing which was of extempore hymns, by the impulse of the spirit." As far as public worship is concerned I know of no adequate evidence to prove that there was any other singing than this.

4. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. "How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm;" or rather, interrogatively, "Hath each of you a psalm, hath he a doctrine?" &c. The passage clearly means, that one had a psalm, another a discourse, and so on; not that all had the same psalm, the same discourse, &c.

See Locke, Beausobre, Macknight, &c.

5. Eph. v. 19. I. V. "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is dissoluteness; but be filled with the spirit; speaking to one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing (*adontes*) and making melody (*psallontes*) with your hearts to the Lord." The first thing to be observed on this passage is, that it has nothing to do with public worship. The reader who will consult Mr. Peirce's note (b) on Col. iii. 16, will perceive great reason to believe, that even that passage refers to the common intercourse of Christians, especially at their social entertainments. I will not say that the apostle does not particularly refer to their love-feasts (though I know no proof that he does); but I think the connexion strongly implies that he does not refer to their public assemblies for worship.* 2. As to the distinction between psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, there is much room for conjecture; but the opinion of Crellius (on Col. iii. 16.) appears to me the most plausible. "*Psalms*," he says, "are songs which were usually sung with some musical instrument, and they are more comprehensive in their subject than *hymns*, which contained the praises of the Deity, but psalms may include

* Slichtingius I observe is of the same opinion. Locke in his Paraphrase says, "Seek not diversion in the noisy and intemperate jollity of drunkenness; but when you are disposed to a cheerful entertainment of one another, &c." Chandler says, "Instead of those impure and drunken songs, which the heathens use in their festivals, let your conversation be enlightened and refreshed, &c."

both prayers and thanksgivings, and many things relating to duty, and the happiness of mankind.* *Spiritual songs* is a very general expression, used in distinction from profane and worldly songs." 3. The grand point is, respecting the distinction between singing (*adontes*), and the word (*psallontes*) which is translated, making melody (or rather harmony). After the statements which I have adduced respecting the import of the latter (in No. 3, and under the word itself) the reader will be prepared for the position, that if the former here signifies the use of vocal music, or singing properly so called, the latter as far as I can perceive, *must* mean playing on instruments of music, or singing with instrumental accompaniments. I see no room for doubt, that we should literally render the apostle's words, and give them their exact force, if we were to say, "singing and playing, with our hearts to the Lord." The ambiguity of the last word, and the awkward associations connected with it by constant use, would make me averse from employing it in a translation of the scriptures, and (as we have no word of exactly the same force as *psallo*) I should not object to the more general rendering, "singing and making harmony;" but then it should be clearly understood, that this harmony was by accompanying the voice with instrumental music, the lyre, harp, or psaltery for in-

stance. By those who feel difficulties in admitting this interpretation, it should be remembered, that Ionia was the land of music, and the Ephesians would naturally employ instrumental accompaniments with their spiritual songs, unless it had been forbidden them; that the apostle, so far from doing this, actually makes use of the word the most appropriate in the Greek language to playing upon stringed instruments, or singing with such accompaniments, and which was never used to denote singing exclusively; and consequently, that at least he cannot be supposed to *discountenance* singing with instrumental accompaniments; still farther, that he must be understood by those to whom he addressed his letter, (unless he explained its meaning in oral communication,) as authorising their employment of instrumental as well as vocal music with their spiritual songs.

I know but of two interpretations which oppose these ideas. The first may be derived from Schleusner, so as to leave *all* musical modulation out of view. But I think I have sufficiently shown, that neither *αδω* (*ado*) nor *ψαλλω* (*psallo*) will allow of this extreme generalization of their meanings. The second is what is given by some of those very valuable commentators, the *Fratres Poloni*. "The heart," says Crellius on the passage, "is like a musical instrument, which we ought to strike and play upon, so as to bring forth sounds and words." And in his *Christian Ethics* (as above quoted) he says, in reference to this clause, "by the former word expressing singing with the voice alone, by the latter compound singing, singing

* In his note on Eph. v. 19, he says that hymns seem to be songs employed without any musical instrument; but he is mistaken if he means as a general statement: for the Athenians we find (see Wetstein) sung their hymns to the harp.

with instruments, elegantly comparing the heart with a musical instrument; as though (he says) we ought to sing with the voice, and at the same time to touch the heart itself, whence the sweetest harmony would arise and melody the most pleasing to God.* This is certainly a very beautiful idea; but, from the following considerations taken together, it seems to me more ingenious than just. (1.) The original of the word heart is never used in the New Testament to denote the organ of the body. If it here mean the affections, the supposed metaphor seems to lose its beauty. (2.) The apostle is not distinguishing between formal worship and spiritual worship, but between the revellings and riotous singing and music of the Gentile banquets, and the religious music of the Chris-

tians. (3.) In the corresponding passage in Col. iii. 16. we find singing with the heart, without (*psallontes*) playing or singing with accompaniments: if therefore we are to suppose the playing to be merely that of the heart, we must also suppose the singing to have the same limit. In other words, if the playing were not really playing on instruments, but merely exciting the affections, the same must be said of the singing also. If the authority which this passage affords for instrumental accompaniments with devotional singing, is dissipated by the admission of the figurative interpretation, the authority which both passages afford for vocal modulation in devotional exercises must also be destroyed. But (4.) the expression in or with the heart, though it might have the meaning assigned by Crellius, is, with equal propriety and much more agreeably to Paul's own use of it, interpreted, *with the affections, with sincerity, with inward devotion of soul*. So in Rom. x. 9. "If thou shalt believe in thine heart;" that is, with sincerity, with inward affection, with a practical conviction.* (5.) If we are,

not to reach the same effect Slichtingius (*Eph. vi. 5*) observes, "As if he had said, although all modulation of voice were absent, it is sufficient if the heart be present; for this will serve you for spectrum and all musical instruments." This however goes farther than the interpretation of Crellius, and is certainly less accurate and ingenious. Without a doubt, the modulation of the voice and instrumental accompaniments are not necessary to render the exercises of devotion acceptable; nor can these avail any thing if the heart be wanting. But this is not the apostle's object. He does not direct to let the exercise of the heart serve instead of vocal and instrumental music, but while using these to do it with the heart, with inward affection and sincerity. Slichtingius (but not Crellius) carries the same mode of interpretation into Col. iii. 16; but, in my apprehension, that passage (clearly corresponding to the present) shows that the heart (or devotional affection) is not to be regarded figuratively as the instrument. But as the prompting cause or necessary accompaniment, or effect, or altogether.

* See also the following passages, in which, among others, *καρδία*, (heart) occurs with the preposition *ἐν* (in, by, or with, &c.) Matthew xii. 37. "with all thy heart." Mark iv. 15, xi. 23. Luke xxiv. 38. Acts v. 4. "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" Rom. ii. 15. x. 6. 1 Cor. vii. 37. "Standeth firm in his heart—and determineth thus in his heart." That *ἐν* may signify *by*, as the impulsive cause: see Luke iv. 1. "Led by the spirit" (compare Matthew iv. 1. Mark ii. 12). That it may signify the instrumental cause, or the necessary accompaniment, of an action: see (among very many other places) Rom. i. 9

in this case to consider the apostle as representing the heart as the instrument, why not the instrument with which the Christians were to play, as well as the piece of music on which they were to play? Consider the heart, the inward affection of piety, as that which prompts the voice and guides the hand, and we have (I think) at least as beautiful a metaphor as that of Crellius. And (6) the apostle uses the word *psallo*, as I have already shown (No. 3.) in circumstances which will not allow of this mode of interpretation; it is by no means necessary nor very appropriate here; and it is a refinement which would scarcely be understood by the Ephesians, well versed, as Paul's Epistle shows, in the Septuagint, unless the connection had shown, which assuredly it does not, that the apostle was contrasting the music of the voice and lute with the music of the heart. The use of instrumental and vocal music was to be accompanied with the heart, with sincere and devotional affection;

or, however well executed, it could have no religious value; but that the heart should be employed, could not, from the words of the apostle, be supposed to exclude the use of either. In fine, the simple meaning of the passage is, that, in their spiritual songs, they were to accompany their vocal and instrumental melody with their inward affections; these were to be excited by their harmony, these were to prompt their harmony.

6. Col. iii. 16. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, gratefully singing (*adontes*) with your hearts to God;" R. T. "to the Lord." I believe there is no necessity for many remarks on this passage. It very much corresponds with the preceding, from the Epistle to the Ephesians; and indeed both epistles, as is generally admitted, were written at the same period.* *Ev χαριτι, with grace,*

"Whom I serve with (*ev*) my spirit." xii. 8. "With liberality," "with diligence," "with cheerfulness." Eph. i. 3. "With every spiritual blessing." ii. 7. "By his kindness." iii. 5. "By the spirit." iv. 2. "Bearing one another in love." iv. 17. v. 9. v. 18. "With the spirit." vi. 5. "With singleness of heart." vi. 15. "Shod with preparation." vi. 18. "Praying with (*ev*) your spirit and teaching with (*ev*) perseverance." vi. 24. "With purity."

* David was to play on his harp, (*ev τῇ κιθαρᾷ αὐτοῦ*) and he played on it with his hand (*ev τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ*). See the Sept. in 1 Kings xvi. 16, 23. xviii. 10. xix. 9, as quoted by Trommius. I have only Field's Sept. to consult, which follows the Vatican copy; and this wants xviii. 10; and in xix. 9. has not the preposition.

* Slichtingius considers the apostle as meaning, singing with the heart as with a musical instrument. This idea never could have occurred to him, I think, but for the corresponding passage in the Ephesians; and, instead of introducing this refined and, I believe, utterly unauthorised metaphor into the present passage, on the ground of the preceding, I should take it in its plain sense in the preceding, because it appears clearly to have that import in the present. I do not object to the idea he expresses in the latter part of his note ("that to sing with grace is to sing with the heart, although there be no modulation of the voice," and "that God and Christ do not require, nor take pleasure in organs and musical instruments, which yield gratification to men, while the heart only affords delight to God and Christ"); but only maintain, that the apostle, in these two passages does not mean, that the Christians should not use the voice

admits of different interpretations. "It may mean," says Mr. Peirce, "with thankfulness, which is very suitable to such an action; or else it may signify, with gracefulness or decency. I most incline to this latter sense, in which the phrase is used, chap. iv. 6. Let your speech be always with grace, that is gracefulness." Upon the whole, however, the former meaning seems to me best to suit the connection. In the note which I referred to in No. 5. Mr. Peirce observes, that the rule in the text stands among others given to the Christians to observe in their conversing together; and in accordance with this reference, which is strongly confirmed by the parallel passage in the Ephesians, he considers the singing here prescribed, as not for their public assemblies, but for their private intercourses. This is also the opinion of Hammond. (Preface to Comm. on the Psalms.)

7. Hebrews ii. 12. "In the midst of the church I will sing unto thee." The Improved Version is more correct. "I will praise thee." The original is the future of *ὑμνεω* (*humneco*); and though it may mean, "I will praise by singing," the only certain force of it is, "I will praise or celebrate." The Hebrew, in the original, (Psalm xxii. 22.) is *elel*, to praise.

8. James v. 13. I. V. "Is any cheerful, let him sing praise to God." In the original there is only one word employed for the last clause, viz. the imperative of *psallo*. The P. V. is here more

and instrumental accompaniments in their spiritual songs, but simply, that these should be attended with the heart, with the inward affections.

literal, "Let him sing psalms." The object of the apostle clearly is the praise or thanksgiving, rather than the manner of it; and since we have no word (as has been before repeated) exactly corresponding to *psallo*, it would probably lead less into error, if we translated it, "let him offer praises." But as far as the reference is to music at all, it includes the use of instrumental as well as vocal melody. And, though I am satisfied that a person, under the influence of religious cheerfulness, complies with the *spirit* of the injunction, when singing or repeating the psalm of praise, or when praising God without any premeditated composition, or when praising him without the use of the voice at all, with that best of all melody, the music of the heart, yet I do not hesitate to maintain, that if the Christian, in such circumstances, expresses the effusions of his heart with vocal melody and instrumental accompaniments, he is *exactly* following the direction of the apostle. It is to be observed, that this passage also has no reference to the services of public worship, but to the private devotions of the Christians. Benson remarks, "These two directions," concerning prayer when they were afflicted, and praise when they were easy and cheerful, "seem to me to refer to their private devotion, and not to their public worship; for if one person was afflicted and another quite easy, what would suit one would, according to this rule of the apostle, have been unfit for the other." So again, "The apostle does not appear to me to have designed it for any thing, but as a rule of private worship."

9. There are some passages in

the Revelations which may be noticed, to render the enumeration complete. Chap. v. 9. xiv. 3. "And they sing a new song." Chap. xv. 3. "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb." In these instances, the verb is *ado* and the substantive *odé*; and no additional remark appears necessary. Several passages occur in which instrumental music is spoken of. Thus, in chap. v. 8. and xv. 2. the elders and those who had gained the victory over the beast, are represented as having harps, the latter, "harps of God;" and a reference is probably made to the same in chap. xiv. 2. In chap. xviii. 22, it is declared, (among other circumstances, showing the utter desolation with which the prophetic Babylon was to be visited,) "And the sound of harpers, and of musicians, and of pipers, and of trumpeters, shall by no means be heard any more in thee." But this last passage, I imagine, in no way bears upon the inquiry; and, for the same reason, I have not thought it necessary particularly to enumerate 1 Cor. xiii. 1. where the apostle, without any reference to religious worship, speaks of the sounding brass and noisy cymbal clearly as unmeaning instruments; nor ch. xiv. 7, where he speaks of the pipe, or harp, or trumpet, as affording no direction and producing no effect on the mind, unless there be a distinction in their sounds. I have, I think, heard that this last passage is considered as opposing the use of instrumental accompaniments when singing the spiritual song; but I am utterly at a loss to see how, in any way, it bears upon the subject.

10. The only other passage, I believe, in which any of the words occur which refer to the present subject, are Matthew xxvi. 30. Mark xiv, 26. where, in the P. V. we find, "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives." The original for the first clause is the participle from *ὑμνεω* (*humneo*): see under the word and No. 7. This, by Newcome, was rendered "when they had used a hymn;" and in the I. V. it is rendered, "when they had recited a hymn." It may mean, that our Saviour and his apostles sang a hymn; or, that they repeated a hymn; or simply, that they offered thanksgivings and praises to God. I do not know that there is any thing absolutely to decide our choice among these meanings. The later Jewish writers say, that several psalms were either recited or sung during the actual celebration of the passover. But their accounts can be but little depended upon, when they profess to give minute statements of the services, &c. before the destruction of Jerusalem. Perhaps it may be truly said, that they knew less about many of those circumstances than we ourselves do. But if it were the fact, that the Jews, in our Saviour's time, did sing or chaunt psalms during the paschal supper, then the evangelist represents our Saviour as doing so; if not, as no other instance occurs to authorize the supposition that our Saviour employed vocal music in his devotions, and it did not, in this instance peculiarly suit the passing circumstances, I should consider the evangelist as merely representing our Saviour and his apostles as offering thanksgivings, or at most

repeating a psalm of praise. As far as I can find, singing was not employed in the Synagogue service at the time of our Lord. Mention is made of singing in Beausobre's Introduction, as forming a part of the afternoon service; but if that writer were not altogether mistaken, I believe there is no sufficient authority for supposing this to have been the case in our Saviour's time; and if it were not, we have no proof that our Saviour ever sang. What music there was in the Temple service, (whether vocal or instrumental,) the people at large had no immediate share with it; and indeed the Temple service seems to have had very little resemblance to what we understand by public worship. It was rather the service of the Priests and Levites alone, in behalf of the people of Israel; and the people seem to have been concerned merely as spectators. The Temple was often employed as a place of private devotion; but never, I imagine (at least not generally), for what is strictly speaking, public worship.

The preceding examination affords I think satisfactory evidence for the following conclusions.

(1.) We have no authority from our Saviour to introduce either vocal or instrumental music into public worship. I do not mean that he has given any injunctions directly opposing either; but simply that we have not his authority in favour of it. We are left precisely as we are with respect to the parts and regulation of public worship in general.

(2.) It is very uncertain whether we have any authority from our Saviour's example, to use vocal music in the more private

exercises of devotion; and certainly we have none for the use of instrumental music. If either, or both, are contrary to his general principle of worship (John iv. 24.) then they are virtually forbidden; if not, the matter is left entirely to our own discretion.

(3.) We have very good authority for the use of vocal music in the more private exercises of devotion. See Nos. 5, 6; also 8.

(4.) We have, I think, equally good authority for the employment of instrumental music accompanying singing, in our more private exercises of devotion. See Nos. 5, 8.

(5.) There is express authority, in the apostle's own words, for an individual's using vocal and instrumental music together, when uttering the psalm of praise, under the promptings of the spirit, in the public assemblies of the Christians. See No. 3.

As doubt may be entertained respecting the last two positions, (though I do not know on what critical grounds it can rest,) I think it best to view the subject negatively, and add,

(6.) That the manner in which the apostles express themselves, in the circumstances of the case, (taking into account the constant import of the word *psallo* in connection with music, and the customs of the age and countries for which they wrote,) completely excludes the supposition, that they regarded the use of instrumental music, in connection with devotional singing, as inconsistent with the nature of devotion, or of the Christian system. See Nos. 3, 5, 6, 8.*

* I also infer from the passages in the

(7) As the spirit of the apostle's directions is equally maintained, whether the hymn of devotion be prompted by the miraculous influence of the spirit, or by the ordinary spirit of devotion, or be accompanied with the exercise of this spirit—whether it be uttered by an individual separately, or by many together—whether it be in the usual social intercourses of life, or in religious meetings—whether in private assemblies, or in public worship, it appears to me that they afford apostolic justification of singing in such circumstances, when the heart accompanies the song of praise; and equal justification of accompanying our singing with instrumental music. But I do not perceive that the New Testament affords us any express authority (perhaps I might say any authority at all) for making singing a regular stated part of public worship, in which all the congregation are expected to join, and still less for singing in parts, a practice which was not begun for several centuries after the apostolic age. For this we have not of course apostolic directions in our favour; for the use of instrumental music with vocal, in devotional exercises, if my reasoning is not altogether groundless, we certainly have. But at any rate, from the whole examination of this particular subject, and all that relates to religious worship in the New Testament, I infer

(8) That the minute regulation of public worship, the parts of which it should be composed, the

Revelations, that the use of instrumental music, united with vocal, could not be abhorrent to the principles or feelings of the first Christians.

time and manner in which it should be performed, are all absolutely left without any restraint (except from the general principles already mentioned) to the discretion and experience of Christians, according to their respective circumstances, social, mental and religious. In some respects we might be well pleased to find a precise formulary of public worship in the New Testament; but in all probability it would have been attended with very injurious effects. It could not have been accommodated to all circumstances, it would have prevented the exercise of the understanding, and thereby often interfered with the culture of the devotional affections, and it would have made more formalists than it could have assisted, beyond what we are already assisted, by the invaluable principles which the New Testament affords us. As it is, we are, I conceive, indisputably left to the guidance of those general principles, in every thing that respects the parts, manner, and regulation of our public religious services.

I have long perceived with great regret that I am widely trespassing upon your limits, and upon the patience of your readers; but I have reason to believe that the inquiry itself (though perhaps not the manner in which I have conducted it) will be interesting at this time, to many of your readers in different parts of the kingdom; and I know not how to make a division without injury to the train of argument. If you can indulge me thus far, I will promise to be more brief in my subsequent letters. In my next I shall state what information I have been able to collect from original

and other sources, respecting the practice and opinions of the Christians in the first two centuries after the ministry of Christ, respecting the use of vocal and instrumental music in general, and the employment of it in public worship, together with some facts respecting the changes which afterwards took place in this part of the religious services; and in my third (and I hope last) letter, I propose to consider the reasons for and against the use of instrumental music in connexion with devotional singing. I am, Sir, (with best wishes for the increasing spread and usefulness of your important publication during the succeeding year) yours very truly,
Exeter, Dec. 1812. L.C.

On Acts iv. 28.

SIR,

Your respectable correspondent J. T. E. [Vol. VII. 753, 754.] seems to understand the prayer of the apostles, Acts iv. 28, as implying that his persecutors were gathered together to do the will of God, by putting to death the holy Jesus—that he was delivered to their hands by the determinate counsel, as well as the foreknowledge of God, and that the act of crucifying him was necessary, or in effect, that they were impelled to act as they did. But I conceive that it was not the meaning of these praying people to teach such a doctrine: it is inconsistent with the general strain of their prayer, as well as with the declaration, that, with *wicked* hands they, (his persecutors) had

slain him. If we suppose the words in the latter part of the 27th verse to be a parenthesis, or to have been misplaced by some careless copier, and take the liberty of reducing them into their proper order, the text will read thus: For of a truth, *against thy holy child Jesus whom thou hast anointed, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* In this posture the text is consistent with the petition of the apostles, that they might be enabled to speak the word boldly, notwithstanding the threats of their opponents; and it makes Jesus, and not his enemies, appear to have acted according to the determinate counsel of God. Let the doctrine of philosophical necessity, true or false, stand on its own basis; but let not the apostles of our Lord be pressed into its service. Had they wished to teach that it was the will of God, that his enemies should gather themselves together against him, the apostles would not have charged them with having slain him with wicked hands. The doctrine of necessity which J. T. E. seems to approve may be true, but it does not seem to have been the design of the writers of the New Testament to teach it. It may be of use to men of reading and much reflection, but not to the generality of Christians, who are not prepared to benefit by it.

I am, Sir, yours,

J. I.

OBITUARY.

Mr. Joseph Jefferies Evans.

Died, December 22d, 1812, in the 45th year of his age, Mr. JOSEPH JEFFERIES EVANS, Merchant, after a long and painful illness, and he was interred on Dec. 31st, in Bunhill Fields, by his relative the Rev. John Evans, agreeably to the particular request of the deceased. His remains were followed to the grave by a numerous train of mourners, who loved and revered his memory. The *Address*, which was of some length, was listened to with seriousness and attention. It has been printed for private circulation, by the desire of the family, and having been furnished with a copy, we give the following *extract*, which more immediately regards the deceased.

“ Standing around an *opened grave*, I would fain impress upon your minds the great doctrine of IMMORTALITY. We are committing to the bosom of the cold earth the remains of a dear relative and a faithful friend, of a valuable and highly respectable member of society. In a Will, evidently written by him with deliberation and seriousness, he acknowledges his belief in an omnipotent and good God, in Jesus Christ his Son, whom he hath sent, and in a future state of rewards and punishment. But with *many wise and good men* he held that punishment was to be salutary in its nature, and of course temporary in its duration. Indeed his mind was of no common cast. Naturally strong, it was expanded by a liberal education given him by his

excellent father, and it was improved by a love of reading, which never forsook him amidst the busiest concerns of mercantile life, and which indeed continued till within a few weeks of his decease. His intellectual energies were equalled only by his moral worth, which he manifested throughout the whole of his career. His disposition was benevolent, and he delighted to DO GOOD. I have myself witnessed his readiness to serve others, and have marked the pleasure which he received when he found his efforts in behalf of the needy and distressed attended with success. Numerous also were his subscriptions to charitable institutions—*his* indeed were the beneficent virtues of the heart.

“ In his *last illness* there were alleviating circumstances, of which his *amiable relict* and *nearest relatives* were sensible, and which with THEM form a ground of thankfulness to the Supreme Being. And it must be a source of no small consolation to the survivors, that every thing was done which affection could suggest, or the tenderest assiduity accomplish. But, alas! his case was irremediable. No medical skill (and the best was procured) could afford an effectual relief. Upon the opening of the body, agreeably to his desire, a peculiarity attaching to that vital organ, *the heart*, was found to be the immediate cause of dissolution. His case indeed was so singular as to be pronounced, ‘ that if ever it had appeared before, it was of exceeding rarity.’ It was, however, his felicity, after

much occasional bodily suffering, to retain his faculties to the last, and to be favoured with a gentle dissolution.—*He died in peace!*

“With respect to *the deceased*, I have no hesitation in adopting the following account, drawn up by a *much respected relative*,— who knew him well and loved him sincerely. ‘With a vigorous, comprehensive and enlightened mind, **HE** possessed a liberal and benevolent heart. All the various duties of domestic, social and public life, he discharged with an affection, a generosity, and an integrity which will ever endear his memory to his afflicted family and to a large circle of sympathising friends. He was a son of *the late Dr. Caleb Evans*, of Bristol, and exemplified in his own conduct all the active and benevolent virtues of his **VENERATED PARENT.**’ ”

Mrs. A. Scott.

Died, Jan. 8, 1813, at her house in Birmingham, ANN, relict of William SCOTT, Esq.

Her memory cannot be so much honoured by any delineation of her character as by the grief which is felt throughout a large town and neighbourhood on her decease, and by the high esteem with which she will ever be spoken of among those who had the happiness of intimately knowing her. It is fit, however, for the admonition and instruction of the living, that her virtues be not unrecorded. Amidst examples of corruption and degeneracy, it is soothing to contemplate “whatever is venerable, lovely and of good report:” amidst many a distressing scene in the domestic circle and on the theatre of the world, it is consoling to re-

pose our views on some of the fairest fruits of Christian faith, exhibited without ostentation in daily life.

The tree which produced such fruits could not but be sound: the principle from which such habits resulted, could not but be of heavenly origin. They who were long acquainted with this excellent woman, easily traced her virtues to the divine blessing on the religious impressions which she received in childhood.

She was born in 1730, of pious parents: in *this descent* she humbly gloried; and it influenced her feelings, her attachments and her deportment through her following years. Her father (the Rev. John Poncks) sustained the character of a minister of religion: the bounty of Providence enabled him to render services which were almost gratuitous to some Dissenting congregations in the vicinity of Birmingham;* nor were his instructions and his example lost upon his only child. By the lessons delivered, by the order observed, *at home*, as well as by the useful ministry of Mr. Bourn and of his much esteemed immediate successors, she was formed to a temper remarkably meek, affectionate, beneficent and pious. At that period, the education of daughters was somewhat different from what it frequently is at the present day: it was no irrational and enfeebling system. If many of the accomplishments, as they are styled, of modern times were not comprehended in its provisions, it was a stranger, nevertheless, to fashionable indulgencies and ease. More

* Dr. Toulmin's *Memoirs of Mr. Bourn*, pp. 280, 281.

of manly self denial was inculcated: and the idea of *accountableness*, both to earthly parents and superiors, and to a heavenly Judge and Father, was more anxiously implanted in the tender mind. The young were exhorted to live for immortality: nor was it supposed that they could be good and serviceable while they were irreligious.

Such, in general, was the education, the discipline, with which this valuable person was blessed: and it was eminently favourable to all her important interests. If she bore in her youth the yoke of adversity and of restraint, her character was, in consequence, more exemplary than if she had been rocked in luxury and self-indulgence: if she was not *early* introduced into *various* society, she was happily exempted from its ensnaring influences; and her heart was not divided between the world and God.

Uniformly kind and generous, her disposition to do good increased with her means of gratifying this darling inclination. Here her memory shines in the brightest light. We too often observe, that the heart contracts with age, and that the love of wealth is proportioned to a man's added stores. But the case of the subject of this memoir was directly the reverse. The greater the abundance bestowed on her by a liberal Providence, the more freely did she give to others. Her language was, "I am a steward for my heavenly master." And, as the shadows of her evening lengthened, she repeatedly said, "Since I cannot live long, let it be my care, while I live, to do all the service in my power to my fellow creatures."

Her bounty perpetually flowed in almost every conceivable channel, and was never interrupted by caprice and humour. Pure and refreshing, it gladdened the eyes and the feelings of beholders. More frequently, unseen by men, it visited the dry and thirsty land where before there was no water, cheered the humble cottage and, by its influences, caused the orphan's and the widow's heart to sing for joy. Whenever religion, humanity, friendship solicited her aid; whenever youth needed instruction, or age repose, her assistance was readily imparted. In very many instances, indeed, and as often as was practicable, the solicitation was delicately anticipated: and her public donations, though numerous and large, were fewer and less considerable than her private charities.

Many young and deserving persons, at their entrance into trade, she supplied with loans of money, on moderate interest: and she was accustomed to speak with particular gratitude and pleasure of the success which followed, in not a few cases, this application of her wealth.

Far from being confined to these acts, her benevolence was the habit of Christian love. It eminently answered to the fine picture of charity drawn by an apostle's pen. Although it may be declared of her, as the sacred historian declared of the ornament of the church at Joppa, "She was full of good works and alms-deeds which she did," her *temper* must not be forgotten. Many weep over her grave besides those who, with sighs and tears, there shew "the garments which she made while she was with them." There

are many who can attest her hospitality and courtesy, the engaging affection of her disposition and manners, and the humility and blamelessness of her demeanour in all the intercourses of society. The law of kindness dwelt upon her lips. She was in the practice of condescending to men of low estate. Wealth and station made no inroads on her heart; for her "the desire of the eyes and the pride of life" had no attractions. That she might more effectually relieve the wants, and promote the comfort of her brethren, she was content to forego what are the usual appendages of opulence and elevated circumstances. To do good was her daily business, her meat and drink. Nor were her bounties limited by considerations of sect and party: they were perfectly catholic. Firm to her own principles, she knew how to respect others in the conscientious exercise of their's.

Arrived at "a period which renders every life venerable," she was still calm and placid amidst the infirmities of age, still desirous of saving trouble to those around her. Conscience bore its cheerful testimony in her behalf; the hope of the gospel was the steadfast sup-

port, the habitual consolation of her mind. A life of more than common usefulness and honour, was closed in peace, and without any pain: and she now sleeps in Jesus, awaiting that crown of righteousness to which she humbly looked forward, not as a debt, but as a boon, as "the free gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord," and ripe for a state where piety and benevolence shall find their amplest, and an everlasting gratification.

To persons who are blessed with those means of doing good, which superior wealth bestows, she was a pattern by which it well becomes them to frame their own views and conduct. Her almost unparalleled liberality in the use of riches, a liberality by which she was known even in distant quarters of the kingdom, is a striking contrast both with the sordid tempers of the sons of avarice, and with the folly and the crime of those whose affluence is expended, so far as their own will and disposition are concerned, on self-gratification, on irrational pursuits, on vicious luxuries, of those who lay up treasures for themselves, but are not rich towards God!

INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. Wright's Tour in the North-west.

[Concluded from p. 61.]

GENERAL REMARKS, &c.

1. To the ministers of the different congregations I visited, who aided me with their advice in ar-

ranging my plans, welcomed me to their pulpits, and did all they could to promote the objects of my mission, I feel greatly indebted—they have my sincere thanks. They enabled me to make exertions which I could not have made without them, at

least not with equal advantage. Never have I met with persons who have entered more heartily into our views and plans, than most of the ministers I have had intercourse with during this journey. Some of them exerted themselves very much to extend and promote the success of my labours; I will not however mention individuals, being convinced that I had the best wishes of our brethren in the ministry, in the different places where I was called to labour, and they shewed a constant readiness to strengthen me in the work. With many of them whom I had not seen before, or merely seen once, I formed a pleasing intimacy, which I trust will only terminate with our lives, and will be revived and perpetuated in a better state.

2. I must also express the obligations I am under to many gentlemen in the congregations I visited, for their friendship, kind attentions, and their zealous exertions to promote the success of my labours as an Unitarian missionary. Never in any journey had I such frequent opportunities of being in large parties of well-informed, zealous Christians, where extensive knowledge, cheerful piety, true liberality, and ardent zeal, were combined in so high a degree. These social meetings, I trust, were productive of much good, they gave me a very high degree of pleasure, and I sincerely thank those persons who were instrumental in procuring them.

3. It has often occurred to me that Unitarians do not yet know either their numbers or their strength. Prior to my undertaking this journey, though I had

conceived there were many Unitarians in Lancashire and Cheshire, I had no adequate idea of the progress Unitarianism has made in those counties; I did not conceive the congregations were so numerous or so large as many of them are; much less had I expected to find them in so lively and prosperous a state. In both counties some congregations are still very low, and a want of zeal is to be lamented; but this is far from being generally the case, many of them are flourishing, and have no small degree of that zeal which is according to knowledge. I rejoiced greatly to find the progress which rational views of Christianity have made in the parts I recently visited, during the last few years.

4. The revival of Unitarianism in Warrington, Manchester, and in the district twelve miles round Manchester, is to be ascribed to the popular and active measures, which have been adopted by the ministers and their brethren. I take the liberty of stating what some of these measures are, 1. The plainly speaking out, or with openness, firmness, and candour, fully declaring what we believe to be the truth of God, both in the pulpit and out of it. Unless this be done, how are the people to be informed, or fortified against the seductions of error? Happily, many of our brethren in the ministry have been convinced of the necessity of doing this, and it is hoped ere long the conviction will become universal. 2. A change has taken place in the mode of preaching; the dry, ethical mode, has given place to the preaching of Unitarianism as the doctrine of the gospel; Christian discourses

have been filled with the sentiments and language of the gospel; in this way the best morality has been placed on the best foundation, evangelical righteousness on evangelical principles. 3. In addition to the provincial meeting, a quarterly meeting has been established, and carried on for some time, in which the ministers and members of different congregations have opportunity of associating together, and of holding that Christian intercourse which tends to promote brotherhood and zeal. Besides the quarterly, a monthly meeting is held by a few ministers, &c. 4. The members of congregations have begun to exert themselves, to second the efforts of their ministers; in this respect several gentlemen at Warrington, have set a noble example to the members of other congregations, by their steady and zealous exertions in the cause of divine truth. 5. The circulation of small tracts, and the establishment of congregational libraries. 6. The establishment of schools, and the attention paid to the youth in the congregations. 7. The holding of meetings for the free discussion of theological subjects. 8. The members of a congregation associating together, and having brotherly intercourse with each other. Such are the measures which have rendered congregations prosperous and advanced the general cause.

5. I have stated the above, not only as matter of information, but because I think such measures worthy of general adoption, and that it is highly important to the interest of truth to adopt them. If I might take so great a liberty, I would say to my brethren everywhere, Let Unitarianism shew it-

self openly, as it really is, the doctrine of the gospel: let Unitarians hold monthly, quarterly and annual meetings in every district where it can be rendered practicable: then the way will be prepared for an annual meeting of the whole Unitarian body, to concentrate their strength, and combine their exertions in promotion of the most important objects. Let the members of congregations exert themselves in every possible way to second the efforts of their ministers, and promote the success of their labours. Let every congregation have its library, its schools, its meeting for free discussion, and become, as much as possible, a Christian brotherhood. Let these things be done, and the effects will be good and great.

6. A district meeting is projected for Warrington and the neighbouring places: it is hoped this project will be realized; and it is highly desirable a plan for village preaching should be connected with it.

7. It would materially serve the cause if an auxiliary committee to the Unitarian Fund was formed at Manchester. It is hoped our brethren there will take this into serious consideration.

8. It has been said that Unitarian congregations consist, chiefly, of persons of learning and opulence; this is no doubt the case in some instances; but it is far from being generally the case. In the parts of the country I have lately visited, many of the congregations, and large congregations too, consist chiefly of persons of the lower and middling classes. I have had abundant proof, that whilst Unitarian Chris-

tianity approves itself to men of learning and highly cultivated mind, it is capable of becoming the religion of the poor.

9. During this journey I preached Unitarianism in nine places where it had not been preached before.

10. On the whole, Unitarians appear to me more numerous in Lancashire and Cheshire than in any other district I have yet visited. The prospect is most cheering; if proper exertions be continued, increased and extended, the pure gospel of Christ must spread on every side, and multitudes who now sit in the shades of error and superstition, will come and walk in the light of it. I hope our brethren in the above counties, will feel and exert their whole strength. Let their efforts be combined, their various resources be called forth, their full strength be united and well-directed; and I predict, that, before many years, Unitarianism will be the preponderating system in many parts of Lancashire and Cheshire.

11. Some persons, have been illiberal enough to suppose, that an Unitarian missionary is apt to obtrude himself where his labours are not desired: so far from this being the case, as in most other journeys, so in this, I have gone to no place where I was not invited to go, and have not had time to visit all the places to which I was invited.

12. Justice to our plans forbids my concealing that many of our brethren in the ministry, and others, expressed to me the sense they had of the importance of my journey and labours among them; they expressed that they were fully persuaded, much good would re-

sult from my visit among them at the present juncture. I certainly would not have mentioned this but as an answer to the question, why should an Unitarian missionary go among those who are already Unitarians?

13. I cannot express the pleasure I have felt in the course of this journey. My heart has sometimes overflowed with joy while witnessing the rapid progress of truth, the success of plans, which commenced under every discouragement, and which have succeeded, beyond our most sanguine expectations. To be so highly honoured by the Almighty as to be an instrument, however humble, in assisting in carrying on so great and glorious a work, as the revival of pure and primitive Christianity, fills me with unspeakable joy. This journey has been full of labour, I wished it to be so, it is labour that amply rewards itself. In no journey have I preached with more uniform pleasure, nor enjoyed higher satisfaction in social meetings and the intercourses of Christian friendship. What I have seen of the information, Christian zeal and affection of my brethren, I shall ever remember, and it will cause me to rejoice for many days to come.

Finally, I cannot conclude without a few valedictory lines, to those among whom I have recently laboured. — Farewell, ye dear friends, among whom I have laboured with so much pleasure, among whom I have spent, what I shall ever deem some of the happiest days of my life. May every blessing be your portion; may you have all the happiness your virtues fit you to enjoy; may your Christian knowledge, mutual

love and liberal zeal continually increase; may all your efforts in the cause of Divine truth, be crowned with success; and may you have the sublime happiness to see error and superstition, vice and misery, banished far from your tabernacles, by the effulgent light and divine power of the pure gospel of Christ. Whether we shall meet again in this world, God

only knows; be that as it may, the remembrance of you will remain with me while I live: and though we must die, the cause in which we are engaged can never perish, it will live and become universally triumphant.

I remain, dear Sir,

Very truly, yours, &c.

R. WRIGHT.

PEACE.

[Under this head, we mean to insert accounts of the proceedings of our countrymen, to put a stop to the crimes, miseries and horrors of War.—Communications on this subject are requested from our Readers. ED.]

Nottingham Resolutions and Petition.

At a numerous and respectable meeting of the **BURGESSES and INHABITANTS** of the **TOWN of NOTTINGHAM**, and county of the same, and the precincts thereof, held at the Guildhall, in the said town, the 28th of December, 1812, in pursuance of public notice, given by the mayor, to take into consideration the propriety of petitioning the Prince Regent and both Houses of Parliament, to take such measures as may lead to the **RESTORATION OF PEACE,**

EDWARD SWANN, Esq. (the mayor,) being called to the chair,

The following Resolutions were unanimously agreed to:—

1st, That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the alarming and unprecedented decay of the trade of this town and neighbourhood, the destitute and starving condition to which thousands of its inhabitants are reduced, and which imperiously calls for prompt and effectual relief, and the rapid increase and insupportable burden of the poor's rates, are to be attributed to the long continued and ruinous war in which this country is engaged.

2d, That to the same cause are to be ascribed, the general stagnation of Commerce, the alarming augmentation of the public debt, the depreciation of paper currency, the decline of national credit, and the oppressive weight of those bur-

dens which have, in numberless instances, reduced wealth to mediocrity, mediocrity to poverty, and the poor to a state of actual and destructive want.

3d, That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the middle class of society, on whom the burden of the taxes, occasioned by the war, almost wholly falls, is unable to bear the excessive weight of public and parochial taxes, with which it is oppressed, much less to sustain those additions, which we are told by the highest authority must be expected, if the war be still persevered in.

4th, That the industrious and laborious poor, being either wholly or partially deprived of that employment by which they were accustomed to support their families; grain and all other necessities of life having risen to a price which the best times could not have endured; the immense sums exacted in the form of poor's rates, are found totally insufficient to preserve those from actual want whom they are designed to relieve, while the excessive pressure of rates is constantly reducing others to similar circumstances of distress.

5th, That it is the opinion of this meeting, that peace alone can alleviate the distresses to which this country, and particularly the manufacturing parts of it, are reduced, or avert the still more deplorable ones, which otherwise must be apprehended, and that the voice of patriotism, the voice of humanity, and the precepts of Christianity, equally call on

every individual to exert himself according to his ability, to obtain the restoration of that blessing.

6th, That from those considerations, we deem it our duty to present petitions to the Prince Regent and to both Houses of Parliament praying, that such measures may be immediately pursued as shall lead to the attainment of this most desirable and essentially important object.

7th, That the petitions which have now been read, are approved by this meeting, and that they be laid at the Town Hall, for the signatures of those persons who are desirous of contributing to obtain for their country the blessing of peace.

8th, That the petitions to the Prince Regent and to the House of Lords, when signed, be transmitted to the Right Honourable Lord Holland, to be by him duly presented; and that the Petition to the House of Commons, be presented by the members for the town.

9th, That a Committee be now appointed to carry these resolutions into effect, and to procure subscriptions to defray the expenses thereof; and that the following gentlemen do compose such Committee:—Mr. Alderman Allen, Mr. C. L. Morley, Mr. Denison, Mr. F. Hart, Jun. Mr. John Green, Mr. W. F. Rawson, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Strachan, and Mr. R. Hopper.

10th, That these resolutions be published in the Nottingham papers, and such of the London papers as the Committee shall direct.

E. SWANN, Chairman.

It was then, on the motion of Robert Denison, Esq. unanimously resolved, That the thanks of this meeting be given to Edward Swann, Esq. the mayor, for his prompt acquiescence in the wishes of the friends of peace, and for his candid and impartial conduct in the chair.

After which, the thanks of the meeting were voted to Robert Denison, Esq. for his exertions on the present, as well as all former similar occasions.

To his Royal Highness the Prince Regent.

SIR,—We, the undersigned, burgesses, or inhabitants of the town, and county of the town of Nottingham, and its precincts, beg leave to claim the attention of your Royal Highness, as being the representative of a sovereign, whose highest glory we presume it is, that he should be

considered as the Father of his people; while we dutifully present, before the throne, a statement of the evils from war, experienced by ourselves, and by millions beside of his majesty's vast family: and while we earnestly supplicate, from a paternal regard, so becoming an English monarch, that relief from dire distress, which the speedy restoration of peace alone can be expected to afford.

On that royal power, which was designed to be a blessing and protection to millions, we call for an exertion of God-like benevolence, which shall speedily terminate a contest, unhappily commenced with precipitancy, and direfully prolonged, by the exasperated passions and the infatuated understandings of men. Many are the motives to peace, and most powerful, which might be expected to influence the mind of your Royal Highness. A respect for the divine principles of Christianity and humanity, it may be hoped, will prevent your Royal Highness from being swayed by the representations of men, whose prejudices, passions, or selfish interests, render them advocates for the perpetuity of a war, which, if much longer persisted in, will evidently be accompanied by civil commotion, by famine and by pestilence.

An awful admonition of our having nearly exhausted the resources of the country, is painfully obtruded on our notice by the rapidly increasing beggary and wretchedness of myriads of its industrious and frugal inhabitants, who at no very distant period, enjoyed affluence or competence; and also by the obviously increasing incapacity of our ablest financiers, even while imposing a most oppressive taxation, to devise means for raising supplies in any wise correspondent to the public annual expenditure.

In the largest parish of this once flourishing, but now miserable town, nearly a third part of its population, in consequence of the interruption of trade, is reduced to the state of PAUPERS; and in the other parishes of the town, not less oppressive to those inhabitants on whom a levy can be made, is the burden of poor's rates. And we are credibly informed, that a like reduction to beggary and want of multitudes of our countrymen, in the different manufacturing towns of this kingdom, is the consequence of the annihilation of our trade, and of the increase of the taxation produced by war.

Additional to these evils, might be recalled to your Highness's recollection those also, which are inevitable concomitants of the most successful wars, even when waged by nations whose resources may be the most ample, and whose condition the most flourishing.

It assuredly cannot be a matter of little estimation with your Royal Highness, that thousands of brave men should be extended lifeless on the field of battle, that thousands should perish by the hardships of warfare: that there should be thousands of mourning widows and orphan children: that thousands of parents should be hurried to the grave by the loss of beloved sons, who were the support of their declining years: that thousands should die lingering deaths in captivity: and that the majority of the survivors of a long and bloody contest, having, in a course of warfare, experienced interruption to those moral habits, which promote the harmony, comfort and welfare of civil society and of domestic life, should, on the return of a state of peace, be rendered less valuable members of society, and less welcome to the roofs of their relations and friends.

As a speedy restoration of peace alone can mitigate the heavy evils we endure, and save the inhabitants of this land, from impending ruin, and the irrecoverable loss of their once prosperous and

enviable condition; as now the ill success and disappointed views of the enemy may lead him to listen more readily to reasonable conditions of peace: we join our afflicted countrymen, in earnestly petitioning your Royal Highness to manifest, by some unequivocal expression or public act of the British government, your truly royal desire to seize the earliest opportunity of sheathing the sword of slaughter, and healing the wounds of a long protracted war: that thus the enemy may be precluded from plausibly throwing the odium of delight in war, and its concomitant miseries on your Royal Highness's pacificatory government.

We will indulge the hope, that your Royal Highness will grant the prayer of our Petition, and that your Highness's endeavours will be effectual in soon restoring to the afflicted people, entrusted to your Royal protection, that lasting peace, after which they so ardently aspire.

Thus may the blessings of the peacemaker descend on your Royal Highness; and thus may your royal father, when called from his present state of sufferings to a better world, be enabled to resign to your Royal Highness, in a state of peace, that throne, which he ascended amid the din of arms, and on which he has continued to sit during so many years of war.

NO POPERY.

Speech of the Rev. John Rowe, at the Bristol No Popery Meeting, Dec. 23, 1812.

Mr. Chairman—I freely acknowledge, that in appearing here this day, I am wholly influenced by a spirit of opposition; for, from the very moment I heard of the measure which has been proposed, I felt my spirit stirred within, and I determined to raise my voice against it, how ineffectual soever that voice might prove—and I determined to move a counteracting resolution, although I should be left to stand here unsupported and alone.

[A stormy discussion here took place, on the question, whether persons who were hostile to the avowed object of the

meeting, could deliver their sentiments, consistently with the terms of the requisition:—it was, at length, determined to hear all parties. Mr. Rowe then resumed.—]

I am not, however, and I wish it to be so understood, actuated by a desire of opposing any of the individuals by whom the requisition for the present meeting has been signed; for some of those gentlemen, from my own knowledge of them, I feel personal respect, and for others, from the general estimation in which they are held; but I am incited by duty, to oppose and protest against the object they have in view, because I am satisfied that it is in the highest degree injurious in its tendency to the rights of conscience, to the cause

of liberty, civil and religious, to the interests and even the safety of our country, and to the general welfare of mankind.—This meeting purports to be convened by persons, who profess themselves anxious for the preservation of civil and religious liberty, and certainly no anxiety can have an object more legitimate, more dignified, or more sacred: I am far from supposing, that they do not conceive themselves to be so in reality, how much soever I may wish that they better understood the *principles* of liberty, for in that case, they must necessarily have contemplated, what opposition has rendered it, the momentous subject of Catholic emancipation, with views more liberal and enlarged. I have no notion of that attachment to liberty, which leads people to love it too well to part with it. Such an attachment, when money is the object, is marked with the stigma of sordid avarice, and when its object is liberty, it certainly does not deserve the name of generosity, no, nor of justice. I put in my claim, Sir, to be a lover of liberty too, and feeling its value, I enjoy it more abundantly, in proportion as I can sympathize with others, who enjoy it as well as myself. The summons I perceive is addressed to those Protestant inhabitants of Bristol, who feel apprehensive that our liberties are endangered by the Catholic claims. I am here on this very ground. I am apprehensive, tremblingly apprehensive, that our liberties are endangered by them; but then this danger in my opinion, is threatened, not by conceding those claims, but by refusing them. I do not see why the Catholics themselves should not come forward on this occasion, in vindication of their own rights, as men, as Englishmen, and as Christians. Shall not those be reckoned friends of civil and religious liberty, who can best estimate its value by being most denied the exercise of it? I trust, that if there be any of this description present, they will assert their right by voting, and if they think fit, by speaking with the same freedom as the gentlemen themselves, who have signed the requisition. I shall be told, perhaps, that the summons is addressed only to those Protestants, who are friendly to the measure proposed. Sir, it is a measure which involves results common to us all, and which must be productive of great good or of great evil to us all. It is designed to influence the legislature,

and it therefore becomes the business of those who augur evil from that influence, to endeavour not merely to counteract, but to prevent its operation.—Would not this petition, if it were carried unanimously, be presented as the petition of the inhabitants of Bristol? And shall we, by whom the measure is disapproved and reprobated, be rendered by our absence or by our silence, the instruments of giving to the desired unanimity, a generality which it does not, in reality, possess? Will it not be said, plausibly and triumphantly said, that all the inhabitants of Bristol are for the measure, if none show themselves against it? That we are all to a man apprehensive, that our civil and religious liberties will be “endangered by the concession of the claims made by our Roman Catholic fellow subjects?” They are called even *brethren* in a petition which I have lately seen; and very properly. I wish to regard every Christian as a brother, however he may differ in sentiment from myself. They are very kindly and very endeavoured by their opponents, as far as words go, which cost nothing; while, practically, they are to be treated still like Popish enemies.—“Claims, no longer requested as a boon, but demanded as a right.” Let me desire attention, for a moment, to this phraseology. Lawyers, I believe, define a claim to be as follows: I therefore infer, that no gentleman in the profession of the law drew up this petition, although it has passed, or seems to have passed under the inspection of several belonging to it, and very able one too—“a claim is the challenge of the ownership or property which one hath not in possession, but from which he is detained wrongfully.” How, then, in the nature of things, can a thing be claimed, and requested as a boon or favour at the same time? Where there is no right, there can be no claim; and that from which a man is detained by wrong, he is entitled to demand as a right?—Do you, Sir or do any of the merchants and traders who have signed the requisition, when you make a claim, consider yourselves as requesting a boon? Aye? but these “claims are not requested as a boon, but demanded as a right, unconditionally and without security.” Sir, it is not so. The Catholics demand, constitutionally demand, their rights, on conditions and on securities, the validity of which no one

an reasonable question. Their conditions and securities are security to themselves. Security in the enjoyment of all the inestimable advantages of the BRITISH CONSTITUTION, of which the Catholics, and pre-eminently the Catholics of Ireland, not only profess themselves, but of which they have shown themselves by land and on the seas, the zealous, the intrepid, and the efficient defenders. Trust, then, to their actions, if you will not believe their oaths. And why will you not believe their oaths? Because, it will be said, they hold, "that faith is not to be kept with heretics." Sir, they abjure the doctrine and they reprobate it. Their denial is accredited by their conduct. Are Catholics more disposed to act fraudulently and treacherously in their dealings and social intercourse than others? Are there not Catholics in this city, who rank among the most upright, the most honourable and the most benevolent of its inhabitants? Do they violate their oaths more notoriously than Protestants? Are there not multiplied oaths among those, the violation of which, to the infamy and the judgment-provoking sin of our nation, is become PROVERBIAL?—If they lay no stress on their oaths, why do the oaths they are required to take, prove to them an insuperable barrier against their immediate admission to those privileges which they have been so long, peaceably, legally and perseveringly endeavouring to possess?—It is with oaths as it is with religious tests; they leave the honest man where he is, while the state gains the time-server, the loaf-seeker and the hypocrite. How have the Protestants kept their faith with the Catholics? Was not their emancipation the condition of the Union? Was not Mr. Pitt decided in his opinion, perhaps of the justice, certainly of the expediency, the policy and the necessity of the measure? Did not this memorable, this heaven-born minister, as many call him, but certainly earth-bred, and sadly deteriorated was he, by the gross, corrupted and corrupting elements of this sublunary state,—did not he retire from office, because he could not redeem the pledge which the Catholics had received from him? I wonder that those who were his implicit followers, while he was alive, and who profess so much veneration for his

memory, should pay so little deference to his opinion on a point so momentous, now he is dead. That they should pay no regard to the opinion of that much greater man, that true and almost prophetic Statesman, Mr. Fox, I do not wonder.

But then, the Catholics acknowledge the Pope, and "the Pope may release them from their oath of allegiance." Sir, I should not be justified in taking up the time of the meeting in combating phantoms. The throne of the House of Brunswick, or any throne in the present day, to be shaken by a Papal bull!! What if the Catholics acknowledge the Pope as head of their church; can none be good subjects of the King of England, who do not acknowledge him in this capacity? Am I to be accounted disloyal and disaffected on this account? If so, then are some of our Court of Aldermen and Common Council, then are many of the most respectable gentlemen in this hall, then are those anomalous Dissenters who have signed the requisition, and Dissenters in general, for we all acknowledge no lawgiver, no head, no king in the Christian church, but one, that is JESUS CHRIST, to be accounted disloyal and disaffected likewise? Though some acknowledge the Pope to be the head of the church, and others Joanna Southcott, the danger arising from both is the same. The tenets of both are compatible with every security which the state can require.—And after all, what is it that the Catholics do demand? Not to occupy the places which now the Protestants fill. They only ask to be put in a capacity for office, if the head of the executive should see fit to call them to it. It will rest with the king to determine how many, or whether any of them shall enjoy office; and it rests with him, instantly to dismiss them by his sovereign fiat, if being appointed they prove themselves unworthy of their trust.—No doubt, if the Catholics and other Dissenters were put in possession of their privileges, there would be more competitors for office, and this, I verily believe, is one main reason why they are regarded with so much suspicion and jealousy. "Whatever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant; to his own master he

standeth or falleth." "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Let the Catholic worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, none molesting him or making him afraid. God forbid, it will be said, that they should not—this they are allowed to do already. Then why expose them at the same time, to such strong temptations to prevaricate and act contrary to their consciences? Why hold over the heads of Dissenters *in terrorem*, penal statutes, which are a disgrace to our laws, if it be not intended to enforce them? "Innovation," it will be said, "is dangerous." This has been in all ages the plea by which the crafty have deluded the weak. There is negative punishment as well as positive. Is it no punishment to be obliged to wear the mask of suspicion and degradation? Is it no punishment to be incapacitated for the enjoyment of all public honour, public confidence and honourable emolument? The restrictions which are imposed on Dissenters are highly injurious to the minds and the morals of the favoured party themselves. How often do we see one of the privileged order disdainfully pass by another that is excluded, without even returning the usual salutation of gentlemen, though possessing, perhaps, at the same time, no superiority in birth, education, connection, character or usefulness. I expected that our attention would be carried back to the days of bloody Queen Mary. But the gentleman who spoke first on this occasion, has carried us back beyond the reign of her father Henry the Eighth, whom he has called, "that GREAT KING." He was a very great king, for he was very *corrupt*, and very *great* too was he in iniquity; one would hardly have expected to hear him extolled for his zeal for religion, although he was rendered in his day, as, I doubt not, Buonaparte will be, the unwilling instrument of great good, in the hand of Him "who maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and who will restrain the remainder of wrath." His object, in all he did relating to religion, was to gratify his ambition and his lust. He held the title, it is true, of Defender of the Faith. When he received this title (from the Pope) he was asked whether it would not be better to leave the faith to defend itself, and for your

majesty to discharge your kingly duties! No one can view with greater horror the persecutions in the reign of Mary, than I do. Those who think with me on subjects of religion, had we lived in her time, would have been among the first victims to ignorance and persecution. But in looking back to the days of Queen Mary, let us not overlook those of Elizabeth—let us consider how many Papists were, in her time, persecuted and put to death by Protestants. What has been the conduct of Catholics in later times? There were Catholics, if I mistake not, who accompanied King William, when he came to take possession of the throne. The rebellion in 1745, because it was in favour of a Popish pretender, may be thought to be a Popish rebellion. "The Protestant non-jurors were much more concerned than the Catholics, a great portion of whom offered their services to the crown! Ireland was quiet, and some regiments were sent from thence to assist the Duke of Cumberland."—[Note: the late rebellion in Ireland, Mr. Pitt said repeatedly, was not a religious rebellion.]—Is it fair to argue from the days of Queen Mary to the present? A gentleman has said, that human nature is, in all ages, the same. No doubt human nature is always radically the same; but do not the dispositions of men admit of amelioration, and their conduct of improvement?—Few Protestants, I hope, would be guilty of what Protestants once were; and the lapse of time, in which all things change, has changed the Catholics too. They have benefited by the increase of knowledge and the progress of the human mind, as well as others, and as we do, so do they hold in abhorrence the atrocities of our forefathers.

I wish the advocates of the petition would promote unanimity by withdrawing it, rather than provoke the discord which either the adoption or the rejection of it must occasion. I wish them to pause before they attempt to carry a measure, so portentous, a measure pregnant with such calamitous results. Have we not wars enough already? Will not a new enemy in America satisfy? Must we have disunion occasioned, and dissatisfaction excited among ourselves? I do not say, nor do I think, that it is the design of the opponents of Catholic

emancipation to goad the Irish to disaffection: but "blind" must they be, and not able to see afar off," who do not see that it is the *direct tendency* of the measures they are pursuing. It is a maxim of Apostolic authority, "not to do evil that good may come," but the denial of the Catholic claims is an evil from which no good can come; and if they be refused, the time, I fear, will arrive, when we shall be forced to surrender what we now refuse to concede. If, Sir, the petition must be presented, I rejoice that our late unsuccessful, but notwithstanding *triumphant* candidate, Sir Samuel Romilly—(I apply no epithets to a name which contains in itself eminence in greatness, in integrity, in disinterestedness, and as far as I know, in every virtue that can reflect dignity on the human character)—I rejoice that Sir S. Romilly is not to be subjected to the mortification and the humiliation of presenting it. Our opponents will rejoice also, that it will be placed in *better hands*. The unanimity I have expressed a desire to see preserved, I do not, of course, mean to disturb, by proposing a counter petition, or any counter resolution. I shall simply move that this meeting do now adjourn.

Speech intended to have been spoken at the Bristol Meeting, by the Rev. Dr. Estlin.

Permit me, Sir, in addition to the important principles which have been advanced, to call your attention, for a short time, to a few principles of a more general nature, which appear to me to bear directly on the subject before us. We have heard a great deal of the *Doctrines* of the Roman Catholics, and of their dangerous tendency. Sir, we are not met here for the discussion of points of theology, and we shall proceed without our guide if we do not set out with distinguishing between the *Principles* of the Catholics, and the *Cause* of the Catholics. It is a singular fact, that of the persons who advocate their *cause*, none are more zealous than those who are the farthest removed from them in *principle*; at the same time, their most active opponents are those who have embraced the same general doctrines, adopted the same

creeds, and taken from them the greater part of their liturgy. This, Sir, can only arise from that strong bond of union, actual or supposed oppression. The friends of religious liberty, though they may be parted by subjects of controversy, and may go, one towards the east, and another towards the west, will, at the distance of a hundred and eighty degrees, meet in friendly union, and return hand in hand together. Sir, I remember, at Paris, in the year 1789, a gentleman of Cambridge, in company with the Abbe Kearney, at that time I think the head of the Irish Seminary, and myself, was speaking with something like an assumed superiority of importance, of the Church of which he was a member; when the learned and liberal Divine said to him with perfect good humour, "You must take care what you say, Sir: Mr. Estlin and I differ in opinion, and we agree to differ; but if you attack *me*, you must borrow his weapons, and if you attack *him*, you must be obliged to me for mine." Sir, I give the gentlemen present credit for the purest intentions possible; I believe they are possessed of piety of spirit, and a tolerant disposition, and that no unkind or unfriendly intention is the cause of their present opposition. Our difference is a difference of opinion.

Sir, of the *tendency* of religious opinions, no one can judge for another. If some men are *worse* than their principles, others are *better*. There is, if I may so express myself, an *amiable inconsistency* in the human mind. The heart often rectifies the mistakes of the head, and the *conduct* of those who *profess* opinions which appear intolerant, is often a reflection on those who make professions of greater liberality. I fear, as Christians, *we all* fall short of our standard.

Sir, to charge a person with holding opinions which he does *not* hold, to expose a person to privations and degradations most painful to a mind of conscious dignity, for holding opinions which he detests, abhors, abhors, and which are proved, by the unanimous voice of the Universities with which he is connected, to constitute no part of his system of faith, is a conduct of which I look in vain for a proper term of reprobation.

Sir, in past times, when the true spirit of the Gospel was little known,

and men's attention was directed almost exclusively to articles of faith, and not to rules of duty, we have seen in many melancholy instances, what a narrow, selfish, excluding, and suspicious policy can effect. In this age of superior light, let us shew the world what may be effected by a liberal, expansive, comprehensive, fraternal Christian policy. I am inclined to think, with an ancient philosopher, that of all the objects of fear, no one is more to be dreaded than the passion of fear itself.

If the Catholics of Ireland be the dangerous persons they are supposed by some to be, let us try what may be done with them by kindness. As affection is the key to the human heart, let us endeavour to open it by that. In this figurative scriptural sense, let us "heap coals of fire on their head."

Sir, it would be time enough to do what is now doing in this country, if every restriction were removed, and the Crown were actually advised to fill up the principal offices of state, both civil and military, with Roman Catholics. To the mere eligibility of such persons, I see no grounds for the operation of fear itself.

Sir, to come directly to the point before us, *the first, the most sacred duty of man, is to worship his Maker in sincerity.* I say, *in sincerity*, for if worship be *not sincere*, if it be not the language of the heart, it is *not worship*; it is simulation, it is hypocrisy; it is that specific crime for which, in the first age of the Church, two persons were stricken dead, that they might be a warning to all succeeding ages; it is "lying, not unto men, but unto God." This first duty of man is sanctioned by the positive command of Christ: "God," says he, "is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Sir, Duties and Rights are reciprocal. Where a Duty lies on one person, a Right necessarily exists in another. The Duty of worshipping his Maker in sincerity is the duty of man; the Right to receive this worship is the right of God. Sir, if these last words are to be found in a writer in whom little that is good is to be found, and whom I was one of the first to answer, they are not taken from him. I had used them, and in opposition to every early prejudice, and to those hopes which are a powerful stimulus to a young and ardent mind, I

had acted upon them many years before "The Age of Reason" was written.

Sir, I am sensible that the following sentiment has not occurred, or does not appear with sufficient evidence, to others; of the truth of it I entertain no doubt. To subject a person to any inconvenience whatever, whether positive or negative, for worshipping his Maker in sincerity, is to attempt to seduce him from his duty to God and his allegiance to Christ; and the infringement of the right is an infringement of the right, not of man but of God. Let it not be forgotten that I impute this to no man, or body of men, least of all to the present opposers of the Catholic claims, who, I believe, are actuated by the purest principles. I am speaking (and let this distinction never be lost sight of) not of *men*, but of *things*.

Sir, not to molest a man in the worship of his Maker is *toleration*; but to subject him to any inconvenience afterwards, seems not to merit that appellation. It is certainly a species of persecution, nor can the degree of it change its nature. Whatever be the degree of it, it is persecution still.

Sir, that toleration is the character of the present age, is its glorious distinction from preceding ages. But the light which now dawns, when it comes to perfect day, will, I trust, render the primitive word toleration, with all its derivatives, a dead language. The period, I trust, is approaching, when we shall cease to talk of tolerating man in his duty, and God in his rights. The word *rights* has been too much used and improperly applied. Happy will be the state of the world when every one will think of *his own duty*, and the *rights* of others, and not of *his own rights*, and the *duty* of others.

Sir, from the causes which are now operating, and particularly the extensive circulation of the Bible, I have formed the most sanguine expectations. The period, I trust, is not so remote as it is generally thought to be, when the person who at present calls himself a Catholic will acknowledge that Christ is the only king in his kingdom, the only head and lawgiver in his Church—when the Member of the Church of England, in consistency with his professed principles, will substitute the Bible in the room of his creeds and articles, acknowledging with the Champion of Protestantism, that "the Bible, and the Bible

alone, is the religion of Protestants; and finally, when the Dissenter, finding his ground of non-conformity narrowed, will embrace both Catholic and Churchman as brethren, and when, every other name being absorbed in the name, the blessed name, which was first given at Antioch, all contention will cease, except the contention who shall most nearly resemble his Master, and by his piety to God and benevolence to man, most adorn the religious principles he professes.

Sir, with these views, which are not taken up hastily, but are the result of many years consideration, I am compelled, from principles of conscience, with sentiments of personal respect, to vote for the adjournment of this meeting, by your leaving the chair.

Counter Petition from Bristol.

To the Right Hon. the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the Protestant Inhabitants of the City of Bristol, whose names are hereunto subscribed,

SHEWETH,

That your petitioners are firm friends to religious toleration, being fully persuaded that no power on earth has any right to interfere with the dictates of conscience, with respect either to doctrine or worship; except only in cases which affect the plain obligations of morality, or the peace and safety of society.

That being deeply and conscientiously impressed with these sentiments, and not anticipating that the plain obligations of morality, or the peace and safety of society would be, in the remotest degree, endangered by the concession of the Catholic claims, they should feel that they were acting a very inconsistent part, if they did not express their regret at the continuance of those restrictions to which their Catholic fellow subjects are exposed on account of their religious profession.

That your petitioners, with humble deference to your right honourable house, beg leave to state, that they are too sensible of the high privileges of the British constitution not to wish them as widely diffused as possible; while there-

fore their hearts dilate with gratitude to God, that they and their Protestant brethren through the United Kingdom have been so highly favoured, they wish that these blessings should be equally extended to all their fellow subjects, and that the state should no longer be deprived of those essential advantages which they confidently anticipate that it would derive, from the equal eligibility of members of all religious persuasions to places of trust and honour.

That your petitioners likewise recollect, that upon a late occasion, a large majority of their own number were called upon, previously to the exercise of their elective franchise, to take the oath of supremacy, which, although it be in no wise repugnant to their own sentiments, necessarily excluded from a similar exercise a large body of respectable and virtuous citizens; and that as in Ireland it has been found that the elective franchise can be extended without danger to those whose religious principles forbid them from taking the oath alluded to, they would submit to your lordships' wisdom, whether a similar indulgence might not be safely extended here also.

That your petitioners cannot, on the present occasion, forbear from expressing in the strongest terms their detestation and abhorrence of all intolerance and persecution, and of course, of the intolerant spirit which disgraced Catholicism in former ages; but as this spirit has been strongly reprobated by Catholics of the present day, and your petitioners look upon it as the vice of the age rather than of the sect, and as they cannot review the conduct of the Protestant churches, at the same period, without feelings of shame and regret, they deem it the more Christian part to bury such transactions in the oblivion which ought to overwhelm them; lest, by reviving the recollection of scenes so atrocious, religious animosity should be rekindled, and the subjects of the same United Empire be rendered hostile to each other.

On these grounds, and others with which it would be tedious and unbecoming to trouble your lordships, your petitioners humbly pray, that your lordships in your wisdom will be pleased to extend to every class of the community, whatever be their religious faith, the equal enjoyment of the privileges of the British

Constitution. By such an extension of those privileges, they should feel their own rights more secure; for they are fully convinced, that by this enlightened policy the hearts of all the inhabitants of this favoured country would be knit to-

gether as the heart of one man, and would present a barrier equally impregnable against foreign hostility and domestic dissention — And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Freedom of religion and freedom of trade, have been the great objects of public discussion since our last; the former, excited by the petitions of the Roman Catholics for emancipation, and the petitions of the Protestant Catholics to resist it,—the latter from the expected application of the East India Company, for the renewal of their charter, which has excited applications from different parts of England, to participate in their trade. The Roman Catholics have put the No Popery party on the alert, and it must be confessed, that they have manifested no small diligence and assiduity in their opposition. They have had a difficult task to perform, for the point was to excite a strong opposition throughout the kingdom, and raise a cry of the danger of the church, so as not to burst into riots and tumults, and renew the conflagrations and dangers of the year 1780.

The plan was exceedingly well laid, and the execution of it, to a certain point very successful. The clergy were set in motion in their cathedral and collegiate churches, archdeaconries and rural deaneries. Numerous petitions were gained from these bodies, though in the two Universities they were not carried without great opposition. The laity, as they are called, were then to be worked upon, and this not by open and public meetings, but by personal applications from house to house, or printed papers left at each house, pointing out where a petition might be signed. Several of these papers have passed under our notice, but the effect of a personal application, in a principal city, as described by a worthy shopkeeper, merits insertion, and

we shall give it in his own words, though they were not intended for the public eye.

"We have had a great deal of intrigue, in getting persons to sign a petition against the Catholics, not by means of a public meeting, but by the clergy, who have each gone round, attended by several persons of the most influence in their respective parishes, soliciting persons to put down their names; I had them in my shop, but none of us signed it. I refused from principle; as, though an unworthy follower of the Christian religion, I think those who wish to exclude their fellow-subjects from an equal participation of the benefits of a government, instituted for the good of all, owing to their different modes of obtaining salvation, act not like Christians, but like barbarians; as according to my ideas of this subject, the great vital principle of the Christian religion, is universal philanthropy. Would, that the clergy of all denominations might unite, in enforcing the necessity of this principle, instead of dwelling for ever upon particular points, which, as the learned have never agreed upon, must, necessarily be beyond the reach of the understanding of those whose lot it is to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow."

By the above-mentioned plan, it is evident, that a very good estimate might be made by those, who were the leaders in it, of the strength of their party, and it was intended to give a decisive proof of it by applications to Parliament, from large cities, towns and counties. But here their operations failed, and it is here that the nation may be congratulated, on the change

of the public mind, from what it was in the time of Sacheverell and Lord George Gordon. The attempt on the counties was baffled by the reception they met with in three of them, Cornwall, Wiltshire and Kent. In Cornwall was such a scene of confusion in the public meeting, that nothing was there gained by the religious monopolists: in Wiltshire they thought themselves secure, and having their requisition strongly signed, had no doubt of a very great triumph; but on the day of meeting, they were completely beat out of the field, both by argument and numbers. The discussion was long, and in it they took, as was natural, the lead: but every topic urged by them for intolerance, was met by a union of eloquence and reasoning, that was irresistible, and of those who came with the fullest determination to follow their leaders, and vote against religious liberty, great numbers held up their hands in favour of it. The debate ended in the throwing out of the petition introduced by the monopolists, and the adoption of another in favour of religious liberty, and the votes for the latter were about seven to one more than those of the former.

In Kent the religious monopolists were more successful, yet even that success was attended with such circumstances, as made them dread the concussion of public opinion. A considerable discussion there took place, and the numbers were so near equality, that the question was twice put: but the majority, an evidently trifling one, was in their favour. In Flintshire, we believe, they carried the day almost without opposition, but in the few towns they attempted any thing, they excited counter petitions, and so lost the effect. It is extraordinary, that in the two metropolitan cities of Canterbury and York, they could not take the field, though in the former they borrowed the Guildhall, of the mayor, for the use of the clergy and neighbouring gentry. In such a meeting, every thing was carried as might naturally be expected; those country squires only attended, who were either tenants of the church, or existed in habits of social intercourse with the numerous body of parsons in such a place; the rest did not choose to attend a meeting, where the clergy necessarily had such a preponderance.

For a long time the question might be said to have been kept out of London, but, at last, an effort was made there, by meetings in several parishes and petitions, to the signing of which the inhabitants were invited by the minister and church-wardens. A meeting was also first held at a tavern, of merchants and traders, which led to a petition from several persons living in the city; and afterwards a society was formed under the name of the Protestant Union, at the head of which appeared the venerable name of Granville Sharpe. When we mention that name, every one will recognize the zealous assertor of the rights of humanity, as far as respects the persons of men, and his services in asserting the liberty of every man, black or white, on English ground; and his labours in the abolition of the slave trade, will for ever endear him to our hearts. We lament, that his views should not have been more extended; that born within the pale of the predominant sect he cannot feel for those without it, and see that civil restraints on account of religion are as contrary to good policy as they are to the religion of Christ. But it must be said in favour of this worthy gentleman, that he is a monopolist from principle, and he would not desire success, unless he thought it to be founded on argument. In consequence of this just opinion, his society has issued a manifesto, in which the question on his side is well maintained, and with that and an admirable paper written by Mr. Butler, the learned Catholic, our readers may be in possession of every thing that can be said on both sides. The Protestant Union falls into the usual error of imputing to the present Catholics, every thing that can be raked against the religion of our ancestors out of the dark ages; not recollecting that if the Church of England is to be tried in the same manner, she must be given up by every honest mind, as it is not two hundred years ago, since she burnt publicly in the flames, men for differing from her in her creed.

The agitation of this question is of very great importance, it is a search-er of hearts. If the minds of men have been made known by it, and we have reason to rejoice at the increase of liberality, still it may be doubted, whether, in this improvement, the

Church does not excel the Dissenters, for, we are sorry to say, that the monopolists boast of having the signatures of many Dissenting ministers to their petitions. The Dissenting ministers in and about London, are freed from this reproach, as they have unanimously agreed to a petition to Parliament for universal freedom in religion. The Deputies of the Dissenters will have met before this meets the reader's eye; and there is some reason to expect that the opinion of the Methodists will be brought forward. Of this very numerous and very respectable class of Christians, many entertain the most liberal opinions, designing nothing for themselves, that they would not grant to others, and considering, that the kingdom of Christ is not meat and drink, is not exclusive privilege for one sect or party, but universal benevolence.

Before the legislature, however, the petitions against religious liberty, far outweigh those in favour of it: though, if the circumstances are duly taken into consideration, the sense of the United Kingdom can be by no means gathered from them, or rather, the presumption is against them. The petitions against liberty are, in general, of the sect established by law, instigated chiefly by their clergy, whose influence, from their property and situation in life, is very considerable; but still, of that sect a very small proportion has taken part either way. With respect to the other sects, numbers have been kept back, from a consideration, that this is a partial application, and having no more regard for the Roman Catholics than the English church, they hardly interest themselves in the debate. Among the Irish the question is full of party feuds; both parties having too much reason to accuse each other of outrages, disgraceful to the name and character of the Christian.

Whilst this Protestant country has been thus agitated by a dispute on a subject, on which the rest of Europe is at peace, and where Catholics have consented to admit Protestants to all civil rights, the situation of the Pope, the great bugbear in this island, becomes an object of attention. After having been kept for many years a prisoner in an Italian fortress, the old man was brought to Fontainebleau, and lodged in the palace, and treated with high honours. The turn in the fortune of Buonaparte has been of great use to him, for the

matters in dispute between them have been brought to a conclusion, and the peace of the church is settled by a new Concordat. By this agreement the Pope's spiritual supremacy is acknowledged, and he is allowed to receive and send ambassadors and legates, and to enjoy his estate in Italy free of taxes, but he must institute every bishop and archbishop within six months after the emperor's nomination, and on non-compliance, the office is to be performed by the senior bishop in the diocese. The Pope has the nomination of ten bishoprics in Italy or France, to be settled by mutual convention, and the six suburb bishoprics at Rome. The power of giving bishoprics *in partibus* remains in the Pope, but all civil power is taken from him. Thus this object of ancient dread is reduced much to the situation of the spiritual sovereign in Japan, or rather to a state somewhat superior to our archbishop of Canterbury. His income is much greater, and his patronage richer; but when we compare his present state with that of his predecessors, it is a fall that must be sensibly felt, and is a presage, we humbly hope, of the approaching dissolution of this anti-christian power.

The question on commercial freedom interests a very large body of men: Hindoostan presents to the historian an appearance which cannot be paralleled by any thing in the annals of mankind; an immense territory held by a few subjects of another kingdom, whose dominion may at a precise moment be dissolved. They hold it by a charter, exactly in the same manner as a tenant holds his land by lease from his landlord; when the lease expires, the land returns to the sole occupancy of the owner, and when the charter expires, the dominion belongs to the crown of Britain. The charter expires within three years, and the question is, whether it shall be renewed and upon what terms. The latter have excited very great discussions, both in and out of the East India Company, and are of a nature to produce animated debates in Parliament.

The East India Company has under its present charter territorial dominion in India, and an exclusive trade to all countries to the east of the Cape of Good Hope. The latter will not be allowed to the present extent, for why should an Englishman be debarred from trading with Madagascar, the east-coast of

Africa, Arabia and Persia, with which countries the East India Company has little or no intercourse; but it contends very earnestly for the exclusive trade to China, and to this there seems a disposition to accede. If the East India Company remains in possession of that exclusive trade to China we must remain in ignorance of the vast empire of China; for a company will never act with that spirit which belongs to private merchants, and if Englishmen in general had had access to Canton for the same number of years as the Company, it is probable that at this time the Chinese language would have been very well known in this country. Restrictions respecting China and Hindoostan may be expected, should a new charter be granted; but it is not impossible that the government may take into its own hands, what seems to belong more peculiarly to its jurisdiction than to that of a commercial company.

It is natural that in a question of this kind, where the parties interested on one side only deliver their opinions, unanimity should prevail, and this was nearly the case in the East India House. One person, however, differed from the body, and his opinions are of more weight, we might almost say, than that of the majority, at any rate they deserve the utmost consideration from the other party in the agreement. But there are several parties in this great question: the government and the East India Company; the outports and the City of London. The discussion between the former involves the rights of sovereignty over an immense country, and also the advantages of opening a great trade to the United Kingdom. The second involves the question of confining or not an immense trade to a single port, and that the port of London. Petitions are prepared and sent to Parliament from the out-ports for a participation in the trade, but this is resisted by the port of London. Here, as is natural, they who are interested in exclusive advantages, will not be at a loss for arguments to support their claims; but London has sufficient advantages in itself, of which it can never be deprived, and to throw more into its scale is an evident injury to the United Kingdom. The Parliament will have to decide upon questions, singular in their nature, difficult in the extreme, and requiring profound judgment and the utmost impartiality and integrity.

A very delicate question of a different nature occupies the public mind, and it is brought before us by a letter addressed by the Princess Regent to her royal consort. These high parties have lived for some years in a state of separation, and their daughter, now approaching to womanhood, is naturally an object of solicitude to the mother. Some difficulties have occurred in the intercourse between the mother and child, and as charges had been made some years ago respecting the former, which had undergone an investigation, but never been made public, curiosity has been on float to know their precise nature. The Princess challenges inquiry: whethert will take place time will shew, but we must lament that any thing should have occurred to injure the peace of a family in which the nation is so much interested.

But important as all these questions are, they lose their interest when compared with the stupendous matters in agitation on the continent. All eyes have been fixed on France, on the manner in which she would receive the extraordinary character at the head of her government, after the calamitous reverse in his fortune. At first, confusion was expected, but the sudden appearance of the sovereign in his capital seems to have broken every measure that might have had in view the abolition of his power. He appeared undaunted, and the moment he returned, set himself in earnest to restore his shattered fortunes. France also united with him, and his proposition of an immediate army, what by conscription, what by gift from several cities and towns, has been received apparently without a murmur. To sanction every thing, he has called together his legislative body, before whom he appeared in all the pomp of majesty, and delivered a speech, the evident produce of his great and unconquered mind.

Here is no disguise of the mortification he had experienced in the baffling of his measures and the destruction of his army. Upon this he says, "the excessive and premature rigour of the winter brought down a heavy calamity. In a few nights I saw every thing change: I experienced the heaviest losses. They would have broken my heart, if, in these awful circumstances, I could have been accessible to any other sentiments than those of the interest, the glory and the prosperity of my people." England, of

course, has the usual share of obloquy thrown out upon its conduct, but all his allies are complimented on their fidelity. His misfortunes, he boasts, have made "apparent, in all their extent, the grandeur and the solidity of his empire, founded upon the efforts and the love of fifty millions of citizens, and upon the territorial resources of one of the finest countries in the world." Peace is declared to be his wish; but it is to be conformable to the grandeur of his empire: and what is the most wonderful thing in this address is its conclusion, that he shall not impose any new burthen upon his people. In this we shall be glad to see him imitated in this kingdom; but from the tenor of the Speech we augur only the continuance of those calamities by which Europe has been so long afflicted. When will mankind be brought to a sense of their duty and by a life consistent with reason and religion, avert the just judgment of God on their sins.

The distresses of France have not produced the favourable results that might have been expected in Spain. The French are as likely as ever to retain the possession of that country; though, if they are to be driven out, Lord Wellington has gained those powers which will enable him to employ his strength to greater advantage. Buonaparte is determined to keep what he has gained: and unless the Spaniards act for themselves, it is to little purpose that the blood of the English is shed in the conflict. One advantage has been gained in the dilatory Cortez. The Inquisition, that disgrace to their country, appears likely to be abolished. The question has been taken up, and they divided in the proportion of three to two in favour of the abolition of that horrid tribunal. We have never disguised our sentiments, that we would rather see the Peninsula in the possession of the French, than that

man should be permitted to exercise upon man those barbarities by which that tribunal is distinguished, which degraded the mind of the Spaniard, and rendered him unworthy, as long as he clinged to so infamous an institution, of the support of any rational being.

In the north of Europe, the Russians seem to have made but little progress. Their armies have probably suffered so much, that they find it difficult to advance, and the French have sufficient strength to make a formidable stand in Poland and West Prussia. The sovereign of the latter country is reduced to a most miserable state. His army may be said to have revolted from him, and to hold one part of his dominions, whilst he is carried by the French to another, where, in fact, with all the ensigns of royalty, he is only a state prisoner. Sweden has published a long manifesto on the wrongs it has received from France. Russia has not had the courage to declare Poland an independent kingdom, and the Emperor of Austria is expected at Mayence, there to settle new schemes and to add his sanction to that of the Pope's to the approaching coronation of the Empress of the French and the young King of Rome; a fete which is to satisfy France for all its losses.

Hopes of peace with America seem to be languid. The former President is re-elected, and parliament here has had a discussion on the war, in which great unanimity prevailed on the justice of it. War is an evil of so tremendous a nature so abhorrent to the character of man, so completely contemptible in itself, that it requires much stronger argument, than we have read in support of it. At any rate, we could wish, that the lovers of Peace would exercise as great powers of mind in the pursuit of that object, which is the true test of men being of the Christian religion.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The reader will again observe omissions in our several departments, but he will see also that we have once more exceeded our usual number of pages.

We have great pleasure in answering the various inquiries that have been sent to us concerning the Meetings of the Ministers of the Three Denominations and the Deputies. The Ministers met on the day appointed and unanimously passed the same Resolutions and agreed to the same Petition as last year: both, it will be recollected, assert the universal, inalienable right to full religious liberty. The Deputies, on the motion of Mr. Rutt, resolved, in a full meeting, Tuesday, the 23d inst. by a majority of 54 to 25, to petition Parliament immediately for "the Repeal of all Statutes, inflicting penalties or disabilities on the ground of religious profession."

Various Communications have been received from the Rev. F. Stone, who desires to make his acknowledgments to *Anonymous*.

Erratum.—P. 14, 1st col. 2d line from the bottom, for *latis* read *fatis*.